Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-87-241 **CONTENTS** *16 December 1987*

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

- Akhromeyev Interviewed on Arms Questions *[PRAVDA 16 Dec]* 1
- Chervov Discusses Missile Agreement *[Sofia RABOTNICHESKO DELO 14 Dec]* 3
- Semeyko on Possibility of Conventional Cuts *[Copenhagen DET FRI AKTUELT 9 Dec]* 4

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

- Further Report on Gorbachev Berlin Departure *[PRAVDA 12 Dec]* 6
- City First Secretaries Meet in Warsaw 6
  - Zaykov Seen Off by Slyunkov 6
  - Warsaw Party Hosts Dinner *[PRAVDA 13 Dec]* 6
  - Zaykov Speech at Meeting *[IZVESTIYA 13 Dec]* 7
  - Jaruzelski Receives Zaykov *[PRAVDA 14 Dec]* 10
  - Secretaries Meeting Ends 11
  - Slyunkov Meets Returning Zaykov *[PRAVDA 14 Dec]* 11
- Trade Minister on CEMA Trade Agreements 11

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

- Further on Pyadyshev 15 Dec Media Conference 12
  - USSR INF Ratification Process 12
  - Envoys To Explain Summit Results 12
  - Next U.S.-Soviet Summit Date 12
  - Discusses Arab-Israeli Conflict 13
  - Lauds Jordan's Middle East Role 13
- Concern Over U.S. Gulf Presence 13
- Chervov Explains Japanese Air Space Intrusion 13
- Moscow Forum on Socialism Ends 10 Dec *[PRAVDA 11 Dec]* 14
- V. Yakovlev Views Soviet, World Human Rights *[IZVESTIYA 11 Dec]* 15

REAGAN-GORBACHEV SUMMIT

- 'Indelible Effect' of Summit Hailed *[PRAVDA 13 Dec]* 17
- Ponomarev Hails INF Pact, Seeks Further Moves *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 Dec]* 18
- Pasko Comments on Improved Relations 20
- Western Observers Trying To 'Minimize' Treaty *[Bogachev]* 21
- OGONEK's Korotich on Washington Summit *[Rome LA REPUBBLICA 10 Dec]* 21
- Gerasimov: 'Achievements Must Be Consolidated' *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 15 Dec]* 22
- Burlatskiy on Summit, Future Prospects *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 16 Dec]* 23
- PRAVDA Cites Foreign Leaders on Summit *[15 Dec]* 26
- Kobysh: INF Treaty 'Only Beginning' *[NEDELYA No 49]* 27
- Nitze Urges Senate Ratification of INF Accord 28
- Larocque Comments on Signing of INF Treaty *[TRUD 11 Dec]* 28
- PRAVDA Carries Gorbachev-Businessmen Talk *[PRAVDA 12 Dec]* 29
- Correction, Comparison to Reagan 4 Dec Interview 31

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

- IZVESTIYA Cites Reagan on Treaty, SDI *[16 Dec]* 32
  - Meets With Republican Leaders 32
- First U.S.-Soviet Joint Enterprise Profiled *[EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA No 49]* 32

Economists Conclude Roundtable Meeting 33
TV Link Addresses Lokshin Family 'Persecution' *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 5 Dec]* 34

Southeast Asia

Further Reportage on ASEAN Summit Meeting 35
    Gorbachev Message to Aquino *[PRAVDA 14 Dec]* 35
    Moscow TV on Conference *[Lukyanov]* 36
    Cambodian Issue Key Focus 36
Cambodian Reconciliation Process Described *[B. Vinogradov in IZVESTIYA 1 Dec]* 37

Near East & South Asia

Jordan's King Husayn To Visit Moscow 21 Dec *[Baghdad INA]* 39
U.S.-Israeli Agreement Runs Counter to Peace 39
    Moscow RTP on New Agreement 39
DRA Military Operation Planned for East Border 40

Sub-Saharan Africa

USSR To 'Help Exploit' Angolan Diamond Mines *[AFP]* 40
USSR, Nigeria Sign MFN Trade Agreement 40
Zambia's Kaunda, Voskanyan Welcome INF Treaty *[IZVESTIYA 13 Dec]* 41
Mali Premier Receives Belyakov, CPSU Group *[PRAVDA 12 Dec]* 41
    Delegation Concludes Visit *[PRAVDA 13 Dec]* 41
Chikin Heads Delegation to Martinique Congress *[PRAVDA 12 Dec]* 41

East Europe

GDR, SED Hail Gorbachev U.S. Trip Results 41
GDR Official, Press Cited on INF Treaty *[IZVESTIYA 14 Dec]* 42
Jaruzelski Addresses Central Committee Plenum 42
Polish Council of Ministers Plan Adopted 43
Warsaw Correspondent Assesses Referendum 43
CSSR's Bilak Praises Bilateral Relations 44
Topics for RCP Conference Debate Outlined *[PRAVDA 14 Dec]* 45
Ceausescu Reports to RCP National Conference *[PRAVDA 15 Dec]* 45

West Europe

Shultz Arrives in FRG To Discuss Summit 46
    Meets With Kohl, Ministers 46
Criticism Forces Chirac To Soften INF Stance *[PRAVDA 16 Dec]* 46
    Chirac 'Glad' About Treaty *[IZVESTIYA 16 Dec]* 47
French Socialist Cited on Arms Control Policy *[IZVESTIYA 12 Dec]* 48
Shevardnadze, Spain's Yanez Discuss INF 48
Belgian 'Readiness To Accept F-16's' Noted *[PRAVDA 14 Dec]* 48
TASS Cites Cypriot Paper on NATO Buildup 49

Latin America & Caribbean

Nicaragua's Ortega Comments on Current Issues 49
    Interview on Military Plans 49
    Criticizes Opposition Groups *[PRAVDA 15 Dec]* 50
    Rejects Talks With Contras 50
Nicaragua's Ramirez Ready for Contras Talks 50

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Sakharov Calls for Afghanistan Pullout *[MOSCOW NEWS No 49]* 52
Zaykov Addresses Moscow Gorkom Plenum *[MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA 6 Dec]* 52
Shcherbitskiy Addresses Kiev Gorkom Plenum *[IZVESTIYA 13 Dec]* 55
Volyn Obkom Bureau Scored at Plenum *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 12 Dec]* 58
Udmurt Leaders Scored for Law, Order Work *[PRAVDA 8 Dec]* 60
Saratov Officials Jailed for Bribe-Taking *[PRAVDA 8 Dec]* 62
'Civic Stance,' Exposure of Abuses Needed *[PRAVDA 6 Dec]* 62
Problems in Forming Plant Councils Discussed
[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 1 Dec] 63
Hundreds Fight North Caucasus Pipeline Fire *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 11 Dec]* 65
Briefs 66
  Satellite TV in Pamirs 66
  Belorussian Magazine 66

Economic

Aganbegyan Answers Questions on Restructuring 66
'Unwarranted' Tatar Price Increase Revoked *[IZVESTIYA 8 Dec]* 78
RSFSR Ministry of Geology Abolished *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 4 Dec]* 79
Profile of Academician Trofimuk Published *[PRAVDA 1 Dec]* 79

Scientific

'Cosmos-1902' Satellite Launched 15 Dec 80

Military

Further on Yazov Military Academy Speech 80
Officials' Sons Get Special Draft Treatment *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 15 Dec]* 81
Communists' Role in Forces Restructuring Viewed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 Dec]* 81
Tactics of Conventional Defense Questioned *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 9 Dec]* 83

Akhromeyev Interviewed on Arms Questions

PM151725 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Dec 87 First Edition p 4

[Interview with Marshal of the Soviet Union S.F. Akhromeyev, USSR first deputy defense minister and chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff, by A. Gorokhov: "On the Path Toward Nuclear Disarmament"; place, date not specified]

[Text] [Gorokhov] Sergey Fedorovich! Under the treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles which was signed, the Soviet Union is to eliminate considerably more missiles and warheads than the United States. Will this not damage our country's defense capability?

[Akhromeyev] Military potential does not consist only in a certain quantity of medium- and shorter-range missiles and warheads for them. There are other military means which ensure the country's reliable defense capability. It was important to deal not only with arithmetical calculations of the correlation of forces in each individual branch of weapons, but for someone to take the first step, to ensure the start of actual disarmament. This is what our country did. It deserves credit for it, because it represents an enormous political and moral gain.

It does indeed mean that we will cut more than twice as many missiles and warheads. But the United States will also eliminate the medium-range missiles in Europe. These missiles are capable of striking targets on our territory with a flight time to target of 8-10 minutes. They were planned for use in waging "limited" nuclear war in Europe. The treaty eliminates this entirely real threat to the European part of the Soviet Union.

It is impossible to aim for unilateral concessions in talks with a partner like the United States. Fruitful talks are possible only on a reciprocal basis, in other words when concessions are reciprocal. This is what happened during the preparation of the Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles. Our country's defense capability was ensured in the process.

[Gorokhov] What nuclear weapons remain, and what kind of military-strategic situation could develop in Europe following the elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles?

[Akhromeyev] The armies of the Warsaw Pact and NATO bloc states will retain tactical nuclear weapons in Europe: strike aircraft, missiles, nuclear artillery.... Basically, these are what we term dual-purpose means, in other words means which can be used with either conventional or nuclear combat ammunition. Under the Budapest program for the reduction of armed forces and nuclear and conventional arms in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals, the allied socialist countries propose that dual-purpose means be also reduced at the same time as conventional arms are reduced. This question is now being discussed in Vienna, where terms of reference for the future talks must be elaborated. All prerequisites are now present for agreeing the terms of reference before year's end, and for the talks themselves to start in the first 6 months of next year. You ask: But won't British and French nuclear forces still remain in existence? That is true, but we reckon that [raschityvayem, chto], following a 50% reduction in strategic offensive weapons, in other words a significant reduction in USSR and U.S. nuclear arms, Britain and France will join the process of reductions of nuclear weapons.

[Gorokhov] The treaty which has been signed applies to a relatively small proportion of the two countries' nuclear potential. Yet voices can already be heard within NATO advocating compensation for the systems due to be eliminated. What can you say on this subject?

[Akhromeyev] Indeed, plans for arms upgrading or so-called compensation for the nuclear missile "gap" which would supposedly open up in Europe are being worked on in NATO bloc states in response to the elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles. Preparations are under way to build up nuclear arms not subject to elimination. In particular, these plans envisage additional stationing of delivery aircraft at airfields and of ships with cruise missiles on board in adjacent seas, as well as the buildup of conventional arms. Such actions are contrary to the spirit of the treaty which has been signed. The danger in such an "arms upgrading" is obvious. Unless it is halted, it could lead to a new round of the arms race and diminish the effectiveness of the document signed. Such actions are impermissible. They could undermine trust in our partners in talks and generally in the United States and the NATO bloc.

[Gorokhov] In Washington you headed a working group of Soviet experts which worked with Ambassador Paul Nitze's similar U.S. group under instructions to accelerate the elaboration of a draft treaty on the reduction of strategic offensive arms. Please describe the 3 days of work.

[Akhromeyev] There was a lot of work to be done in Washington. The talks were held within the framework of the extensive program of the Soviet delegation's stay as a whole. Talks were conducted between the groups of experts over many hours and were dogged and difficult. Eight sessions were held in all over the 3 days. We encountered a rigid stance from the U.S. side on a number of questions. The talks on the linkage [vzaimosvyaz] between a future treaty on strategic offensive arms and the existing ABM Treaty which the sides signed in 1972 were particularly complex. There was a struggle over how this treaty should be understood. In other words, the U.S. experts proposed to us the creation [sozdavat] of a system for the country's ABM defense. We resolutely opposed that.

[Gorokhov] That is, the U.S. experts sought to break the linkage between the ABM Treaty and the future treaty on strategic offensive arms?

[Akhromeyev] Just so, to break or at least weaken it. In order to prevent that, we ensured that the following was written in the joint statement: The sides are obliged to observe the ABM Treaty in the form in which it was signed in 1972. In addition, the U.S. experts, striving for a reduction in strategic offensive arms on the basis of the U.S. stand, sought at the same time to remove long-range sea-based cruise missiles from possible restrictions, that is, to channel the arms race in that direction and secure advantages for themselves. Our interlocutors' "arguments" on this score were as follows: It is difficult, even impossible to verify cruise missiles in this category. The Americans also groundlessly insisted on including our TU-22M medium bomber on the list of strategic offensive arms. As a result of strenuous work and on the basis of mutual concessions we succeeded in coordinating and drawing the sides' positions closer and in finding mutually acceptable solutions — which was recorded in the two leaders' joint statement.

[Gorokhov] One of the features of the treaty that has been signed is the volume and profundity of the proposed verification measures. Do we possess in equal measure the potential and the technical means of verification?

[Akhromeyev] I will note in this connection that we could have gone further on questions of verification. But the U.S. side itself removed a number of positions and did not undertake to agree them. We are ready for strict verification on a mutual basis. It is important that this be verification of disarmament. We possess the necessary means, including means of verifying long-range sea-based cruise missiles.

[Gorokhov] What are the prospects for an agreement on the limitation of nuclear tests?

[Akhromeyev] The Soviet Union advocates an end to all nuclear tests without delay and is ready to halt the implementation of its own nuclear programs any day. The United States is not prepared to do this. If it is not possible to achieve a total ban in the very near future, it is essential to agree on a significant reduction in the yield of nuclear explosions and decisively reduce their number. Since the process of real disarmament is beginning, questions of nuclear tests should also be resolved in just this way.

[Gorokhov] What difficulties do you think have to be overcome when drawing up the terms of reference for the talks on conventional armed forces and armaments in Europe?

[Akhromeyev] The first problem is to establish the imbalances and asymmetries in the two sides' arms and armed forces. Incidentally, we have long suggested to the NATO countries that this be done. First determine the imbalances, and then decide how much to reduce on each side. The second important point is our approach to reducing dual-purpose facilities, that is, those which use either nuclear or conventional ammunition. I am talking about tactical strike aircraft, tactical missiles, and nuclear artillery. They cannot really be made into a separate category from conventional arms because they are, after all, dual-purpose. The NATO bloc states do not want to include strike aircraft in the talks because they have the advantage here. These are the two key issues on which no consensus has yet been reached for drawing up terms of reference for the future talks.

[Gorokhov] The question of Afghanistan. It must be admitted that this issue does appear in many letters from PRAVDA readers. The decision to withdraw the limited contingent of Soviet troops has been taken and a deadline set — 12 months. What can you say about the implementation of this decision?

[Akhromeyev] The political decision to withdraw the troops has been taken. The beginning of the Soviet troop withdrawal from Afghanistan depends on one thing only: the United States' ceasing its interference in that country's internal affairs. As soon as the United States stops supplying arms to and financing counterrevolutionary forces, the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan will begin.

[Gorokhov] Have the views of the Soviet military leadership on the problem of banning and eliminating chemical weapons undergone any change of shape [deformatsiya]?

[Akhromeyev] No, they have not. We have been and continue to be in favor of banning chemical weapons, including binary weapons. Moreover, reliable verification of all forms of chemical weapon production must be ensured, including multinational corporations and private firms.

Some progress has been made at the talks on this problem. However, recently the United States has begun to drag out the talks on this issue, citing verification difficulties. One would like to hope that the joint Soviet-U.S. statement adopted in Washington will give a boost to these talks.

[Gorokhov] As far as I am aware, you are the first Soviet military leader to visit the Pentagon and take part in talks with members of the U.S. Armed Forces Joint Chiefs of Staff.

[Akhromeyev] Together with Academician Ye. Velikhov and Ambassador V. Karpov, I had a meeting with U.S. Defense Secretary Frank Carlucci on 9 December. We talked mainly about the consequences of possible U.S. deployment of an ABM system as a result of implementing its SDI program. We expressed our negative attitude to the deployment of this system. The next day we had a conversation with Admiral William Crowe, chairman of the U.S. Armed Forces Joint Chiefs of Staff, the chiefs of staff of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and the commander of the U.S. Marine Corps. Our conversations concerned purely military problems. In this context our discussions included the question of possibly expanding contacts along military lines. The meetings proceeded in a correct, frank atmosphere.

Chervov Discusses Missile Agreement

AU161035 Sofia RABOTNICHESKO DELO in Bulgarian 14 Dec 87 p 6

[Report on interview with Colonel General Nikolay Chervov, "member of the delegation to Washington," by Edgar Cheporov, NOVOSTI special correspondent in Washington, "specially for RABOTNICHESKO DELO through NOVOSTI": "Balance of Interests for Security and Peace"]

[Text] The signing of the Treaty on Eliminating Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles has been called a historic event for the United States, the USSR, and the whole of mankind. For the first time the two states have agreed to eliminate two classes of nuclear weapons. Peace was made more secure, and our common future safer. What lay behind the treaty signing, how did this memorable act become possible? Edgar Cheporov, NOVOSTI special correspondent in Washington, approached Colonel General Nikolay Chervov, the eminent military expert and member of the delegation to Washington, for an answer to this question.

[Chervov] The signing became possible because people realized that in the arms race the world was approaching the line that it will be suicide to cross. There will be no turning back, everyone will perish. Enough weapons—mainly U.S. and Soviet—have accumulated in the world to annihilate every living thing on earth. As far back as 1962 U.S. President Kennedy said that nuclear weapons were suspended, like the sword of Damocles, by a hair over the heads of mankind. Since that time a quarter of a century has elapsed, and the nuclear potential of the United States and the Soviet Union has in that time increased more than five-fold. This, in my view, is the main reason that prompted the leaders of the two states to arrive at a new political thinking and realize the necessity of a radical change in the development of international relations, the necessity of using all possible means to halt the arms race. The treaty signed in Washington is also the first attempt to halt this arms race. We are witnesses of how history is being created before our very eyes, and of how the real reduction of nuclear arms is beginning.

[Cheporov] What is the importance of the treaty from a purely military viewpoint?

[Chervov] First, it will eliminate the most destabilizing, most dangerous, and most provocative nuclear weapons, located on the threshold of the Soviet Union. For many years the United States has been increasing their numbers, and blackmailing the Soviet Union. Much has also been written about the launching of a limited nuclear war. Behind this idea was concealed a desire to limit the framework of the nuclear conflict to Europe or other regions, and in this way protect the United States.

History, as we have seen, arranged things differently—the forward-based U.S. missiles will be reduced in number. This process will begin with the medium- and shorter-range missiles. When it is said that the Soviet Union will destroy more missiles and warheads—and we will indeed eliminate almost twice as many more—it does not therefore follow that we, the Soviet people, have been "outwitted" at the negotiations. Arithmetical calculations do not apply here; the most important thing is the balance of the interests of security, and it is important that the threat posed to the Soviet Union by the most dangerous type of missiles is falling away. In their time General Rogers, and later U.S. Navy Secretary Lehman, have said that the Pershings are aimed straight at the Kremlin, that they "are able to strike not only the Kremlin, but even every building within it." As far as the United States is concerned, our medium-range missiles do not reach their territory, notwithstanding the fact that the threat of our missiles to their European allies and the U.S. forces stationed in Europe will be eliminated.

[Cheporov] But doesn't it mean in this case that the Soviet Union has gained more than the United States? We were under threat from the U.S. missiles, and now they are doing away with them, whereas before our own missiles did not reach the United States anyway.

[Chervov] I stress again, the whole thing lies in the balance of interests for security. We have reduced more missiles and more warheads and made compromise concessions regarding numbers, but are therefore bringing the balance of security back into equilibrium. The security will be identical.

[Cheporov] How do you assess the trend in the development of arms reduction and elimination? What might stem from the present treaty?

[Chervov] This trend made its appearance here, in Washington, in the statements of General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev and President Reagan when they signed the treaty. They undertook obligations to continue resolving the disarmament problems in all spheres, in the first place regarding strategic offensive arms, this key issue in Soviet-U.S. relations.

Immediately following the signing of the INF Treaty a gathering of experts from both sides took place. The Soviet side, in which I am a member, is led by Marshal of the Soviet Union S.F. Akhromeyev, and the U.S. by Paul Nitze, assistant secretary of state on disarmament issues. We succeeded in discussing the general position regarding strategic offensive arms, and exchanged written documents on how we view the continuation of the process. We are also engaged in drawing up an agreed declaration on strategic offensive arms and their reduction by 50%. Following this, instructions will be issued to our delegations in Geneva to speed up the preparation of such a treaty, before May 1988. The treaty is supposed to be ready for signing by the Soviet and U.S. leaders before President R. Reagan makes his visit to Moscow.

[Cheporov] What are the delegations' approaches regarding SDI?

[Chervov] The U.S. experts declared that SDI is not an issue for "bargaining," and that they have no instructions to discuss this problem. As regards the Soviet position, this is completely clear. We are fully prepared to make a 50% cut in strategic offensive weapons provided that the ABM Treaty is strictly observed in the interpretation under which it was signed and ratified in 1972. The countries must undertake the obligation not to deviate from this treaty for the agreed upon period. We discussed all this with the U.S. experts. Now the issue has suddenly cropped up of the U.S. attitude toward the ABM Treaty. They answered us that the main task is to cut strategic offensive arms. Let us see what happens, they say. If we reach such an agreement, then it will be possible to talk about the attitude to SDI. In my view this is a trick. It is simply impossible for us to engage in a real reduction in strategic offensive arms without the strictest observance of the ABM Treaty. There exists an objective interconnection between the ABM Treaty and strategic nuclear arms potential, like the one between the shield and the sword, armor and the artillery shell, or defense and attack.

Semeyko on Possibility of Conventional Cuts

PM151131 Copenhagen DET FRI AKTUELT in Danish 9 Dec 87 p 19

["Commentary" by APN's Lev Semeyko: "The Russians Are Coming"]

[Text] The treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles is about to be signed, but many people in Europe are concerned that the treaty will mean a greater role for conventional arms—an area in which the Russians and their allies have always been said to be strong.

It is correct that as far as tanks and several other forms of conventional arms are concerned the Warsaw Pact outnumbers NATO, but the most important thing is tank forces. It was chiefly these forces of which postwar U.S. Defense Secretary Forrestal was fearful when he shouted out of the window "The Russians are coming." However, over 40 years have passed since then. Without these fears abating. When people are afraid they have no faith in anything, and in the present case this "anything" is the possibility of a viable nuclear-free zone.

Thus, a psychological factor becomes a political factor, and Moscow cannot of course ignore this fact. However, Moscow too does not think that it is possible to remove these fears simply through verbal declarations of its desire for peace. The most important thing is practical action, and this has already been taken. It has found its expression in two fundamental official documents: the Warsaw Pact's Budapest Appeal and the same alliance's military doctrine signed on the same day that Mathias Rust landed in Red Square, demonstrating in his own way that Soviet military strength should not be exaggerated.

The above-mentioned documents show that the Warsaw Pact's leaders understand that military-strategic stability must be established in Europe and that both sides must recognize this.

The Budapest Appeal proposes that the military groupings facing each other in Europe should be cut by more than 1 million men in the nineties. Even the most skeptical cannot view this as a trick. For if Moscow has aggressive intentions, it would hardly promote them by withdrawing hundreds of thousands of soldiers.

It is often asserted in the West that this proposal is unfair because it speaks of equal reductions at a time when the Warsaw Pact has superior forces. This would mean that in the final analysis the East would be drawing the long straw.

This objection is only taken seriously by people who have not looked into the matter. What is referred to here is simply the size of reductions, and not the methods of carrying them out. Mikhail Gorbachev described these methods sufficiently clearly a month after the Budapest Appeal: "Let us look at all this in a new way. As far as the categories of arms where the West is superior are concerned, the West should make cuts, and in those fields in which we are in the lead we will not hesitate to cut back our superiority."

This was the message given to Mitterrand, and thus to the whole of the West, during his visit to Moscow.

The principle for cuts which we take as our point of departure is therefore that cuts should be made where one side has more than the other. This also applies to tank forces. This principle is asymmetric and does not mean exactly equal cuts—and the West should take note of this, if it wants to be objective.

It is of course also possible to say that what a Soviet leader says is one thing and an official document from the Warsaw Pact is something else. Let me therefore quote a passage from the document on the Warsaw Pact's military doctrine: "The existing imbalance and asymmetry within individual arms classes and the efforts to remove any such imbalance or asymmetry through cuts by whichever side may be superior can also be the subject of consultations."

Thus this is the official stance and on the basis of it the Warsaw Pact's and the Soviet Union's superiority in tanks could eventually become a thing of the past if that is what NATO really wants.

The stance of the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact is not static. It is developing all the time, taking into account the security of both sides. Moscow takes the view that the qualitative side of security is just as important as the quantitative.

What is being addressed here is the possibility of launching an attack. The Budapest Appeal proposes that such a possibility be reduced through force reductions. The Berlin document goes even further. Along the line of contact of NATO and Warsaw Pact forces a much less explosive situation would be guaranteed if "the most dangerous categories of attack weapons" were removed from this line "and troop concentrations were reduced to an agreed minimum level."

It is also proposed that, following reductions in conventional arms, all means "of mutual attack on the other side and of carrying out attack operations at all" be abolished. Such means are not described in concrete terms, since the doctrine is one of basic principle, but it is clear that it is chiefly referring to tanks.

Further Report on Gorbachev Berlin Departure

PM151539 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Dec 87 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Departure of M.S. Gorbachev for Moscow"]

[Text] Berlin, 11 Dec—M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, who had been taking part in the meeting of leading figures of Warsaw Pact states, left Berlin today. E.A. Shevardnadze, A.N. Yakovlev, D.T. Yazov, A.F. Dobrynin, V.A. Medvedev, V.M. Kamentsev, S.F. Akhromeyev, and A.S. Chernyayev also left with him.

M.S. Gorbachev was seen off at the airport by E. Honecker, W. Stoph, H. Sindermann, H. Axen, H.J. Boehme, J. Herrmann, H. Dohlus, H. Kessler, G. Kleiber, E. Krenz, W. Krolikowski, S. Lorenz, E. Mielke, G. Mittag, E. Mueckenberger, A. Neumann, H. Tisch, W. Felfe, K. Hager, G. Schabowski, W. Eberlein, W. Jarowinsky, W. Walde, I. Lange, G. Mueller, H. Soelle, and O. Fischer.

V.I. Kochemasov, USSR ambassador to the GDR, was among the send-off party.

City First Secretaries Meet in Warsaw

Zaykov Seen Off by Slyunkov

LD121154 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0700 GMT 12 Dec 87

[Text] Lev Zaykov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and secretary of the Moscow Gorkom, today left Moscow for Warsaw to attend a meeting of first secretaries of city committees of parties of socialist countries' capitals. At the airport he was seen off by Slyunkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and other officials. Also present was Smolinsky, charge d'affaires ad interim of the Polish People's Republic in the USSR.

Warsaw Party Hosts Dinner

PM141621 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Dec 87 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "New Level of Cooperation Between Fraternal Parties"]

[Excerpts] Warsaw, 12 Dec—The Polish capital became the venue of the first meeting of leaders of party organizations from the capitals of Bulgaria, Hungary, the GDR, Poland, the USSR and the CSSR. During the period of revolutionary renewal in all spheres of social life, the fraternal parties are engaged in a creative quest for new forms and methods of organizational and ideological work. Direct dialogue and exchange of international experience are very important in this context. [passage omitted]

The Warsaw City PZPR Committee gave an official dinner in honor of the participants in the meeting. L.N. Zaykov spoke on their behalf, expressing gratitude to the Warsaw City PZPR Committee for the cordial reception.

Today's meeting with W. Jaruzelski, first secretary of the PZPR Central Committee and chairman of Poland's State Council, and the exchange of opinions on questions which are topical for us all, are certainly useful and important, he said.

Our first meeting will make it possible to understand each other's problems and study each other's experience, and will help the further strengthening and development of ties between Communists and working people from our capitals.

We have gathered at a time which is particularly important for the fate of peace. The meeting between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and the U.S. President which has only just ended, the signing of the Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles, and the accords which were reached as regards the ways to further reduction of nuclear arms could become an historical landmark marking the start of a countdown along the way to a nuclear-free world.

That which has been achieved is the result of collective efforts by our fraternal parties and peoples and of their unity and cohesion in the struggle to preserve peace on earth, the result of the strengthening of socialism's positions in the international arena.

Communists and working people in Warsaw and the capitals of socialist community countries are making their contribution to the tireless struggle to preserve peace, for friendship and cooperation among peoples.

There is no doubt that our joint fruitful work in Warsaw will serve the further strengthening of businesslike cooperation between the capitals' party organizations and the all-around development of relations between our parties, countries, and peoples.

We all have a special need for such open and comradely collaboration now, when our parties are implementing the decisions of their congresses and are persistently working on the solution of large-scale socioeconomic tasks.

The CPSU's attention is focused on two linked fundamental problems of the new stage of restructuring—further democratization and radical economic reform. Soviet people are fully determined to fulfill all plans.

L.N. Zaykov proposed a toast in honor of the further strengthening and development of fruitful relations between our parties and their central committees, to socialist Poland and its capital, Warsaw, wished success to the Warsaw City PZPR organization in the solution of the tasks facing it, and wished success to the party organizations of Berlin, Budapest, Prague, and Sofia. He proposed a toast in honor of the fraternal friendship between our countries, capitals, and peoples.

Zaykov Speech at Meeting

PM141330 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Dec 87 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS special correspondent report: "A New Level of Cooperation Among the Fraternal Parties"]

[Excerpt] Warsaw, 12 Dec—The Polish capital was the venue for the first meeting of leaders of the party organizations of the capitals of Bulgaria, Hungary, the GDR, Poland, the USSR, and Czechoslovakia. In the period of revolutionary renewal of all spheres of public life, the fraternal parties are conducting a creative quest for new forms and methods of organizational and ideological work. Here direct dialogue and the exchange of international experience are very important.

Naturally, the priority here belongs to the capitals, whose party organizations bear special responsibility. This was stressed at the opening of the meeting by the participants—J. Kubasiewicz, candidate member of the PZPR Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of Warsaw PZPR Committee; I. Panev, member of the BCP Central Committee and first secretary of Sofia City BCP Committee; F. Havasi, member of the MSZMP Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of Budapest City MSZMP Committee; G. Schabowski, member of the Politburo and secretary of the SED Central Committee and first secretary of Berlin Bezirk SED Committee; and A. Kapek, member of the CPCZ Central Committee Presidium and first secretary of Prague City CPCZ Committee.

L.N. Zaykov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and first secretary of Moscow party gorkom, said in his speech:

First of all, allow me cordially to greet you on behalf of the CPSU Central Committee, Moscow's Communists, and the party gorkom.

I take pleasure in conveying to the participants in our meeting comradely greetings from M.S. Gorbachev, who wished us success in our work, emphasizing the exceptionally great significance of direct business contacts between the leaders of the capitals' gorkoms. The capitals' party organizations, he noted, play a special role as leaders, largely setting the tone for all the multifaceted activity of our parties.

The meeting, L.N. Zaykov went on, is taking place in a very important, crucial period of history. The Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles has just been signed.

All mankind welcomes the results of the talks which paved the way toward a nuclear-free world. However, the elimination of an entire class of missiles has special significance for our continent, Europe. After all, it was not for nothing that the missiles which are struck out of the arsenals—thanks, above all, to the peace-loving foreign policy line of the Warsaw Pact states—were called "Euromissiles." They threatened first and foremost our continent, whose territory has suffered greatly and was literally torn apart by the military conflicts of various eras.

Through the efforts of the CPSU, the fraternal parties, and our countries, an important step was taken toward solving problems which have become acute for all mankind. At the Washington talks M.S. Gorbachev showed tremendous wisdom, political will, and readiness for an open, concrete dialogue. All this generates tremendous trust throughout the world in the USSR's foreign policy course.

The Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles is only a few days old. But people in various countries and on various continents are unanimous in assessing this historic document as a triumph for the new political thinking which our party has made the foundation of the struggle to ensure a stable nuclear-free and nonviolent world.

During the complex and difficult talks in Washington the Soviet delegation constantly sensed the comradely support of the fraternal parties, governments, and peoples of the socialist countries. A graphic example of this is the message which M.S. Gorbachev received from W. Jaruzelski during the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting.

Openness, glasnost, and the utter honesty of our foreign policy imply profound respect for our partners, and first and foremost for our natural allies—the fraternal socialist countries.

On the way home from the United States, the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee gave a detailed briefing in Berlin to the leaders of the Warsaw Pact states on the results of the Soviet-U.S. meeting. The practice of such meetings to impart information has become a good tradition in the socialist community and reflects the new level of our relations.

In conditions where the socialist countries are entering a new stage of their development—a stage of profound exploration and reforms, of closer all-around cooperation—the natural process of internationalization of the restructuring is gathering pace, the speaker went on to say. Today the study and use of our aggregate experience in building the new society are taking on particular significance.

The CPSU, he stressed, will continue to proceed on the basis that the strengthening of friendship and the all-around development of cooperation with the socialist countries is the main priority in the Soviet Union's international policy. Our aim now is, together with our friends, to move forward broadly and confidently in the practical use of the potential inherent in the socialist system and to augment its magnetic force.

I consider it my duty to inform you of the main focus of our party's activity at present. The celebration of the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution was a political event of truly worldwide significance.

For our party, this glorious anniversary heralded the start of a fundamentally new stage of practical activity. The CPSU Central Committee October Plenum and the jubilee celebrations confirmed convincingly that there is no alternative to the policy of restructuring and the course of the Central Committee April (1985) Plenum and the 27th CPSU Congress.

This course has met with the firm support of the vast majority of the Soviet people. Convincing examples of this are provided by literally every day of our society's life.

The CPSU Central Committee orients the party, trade union, and Komsomol organizations and soviet and economic organs toward resolving, as a priority, two interconnected, key problems which determine the fate of the restructuring. They are the democratization of public life and radical economic reform.

Soviet people, having been granted the broadest access to the management of all the affairs of society and the country, are not simply awaiting tangible practical results from the restructuring, but are struggling increasingly actively to attain them and to make effective use of the new economic management conditions. They realize that the implementation of large-scale social programs depends on the unconditional fulfillment of the 5-year plan.

On the basis of stable economic development, measures are being implemented aimed at significantly increasing the country's food resources, ensuring major developments in tackling the housing problem, saturating the market with goods and services, and developing health care, public education, and the entire social and spiritual sphere.

Soviet people have responded to this party and state policy with a proprietorial approach to the cause and by strengthening discipline and order and stepping up the struggle against everything that acts as a brake on our progress.

The deepening process of restructuring dictates the urgent need for a further heightening of the party's vanguard role in society.

Our party boldly uncovers and objectively analyzes the contradictions of practical life and consistently elaborates and implements political, economic, organizational, and ideological measures for the all-around renewal of Soviet society. It is our profound conviction that this is a guarantee of the full triumph of the ideas of the restructuring.

The speaker went on to give a brief characterization of the Moscow City party organization and explain what the Soviet capital's Communists are presently working on and the priority and long-term tasks of the present stage of the restructuring.

The Moscow party organization, he said, is a large detachment of the CPSU and is called upon to play an important role in the life of the entire party and country. L.N. Zaykov analyzed progress by the Moscow labor collectives in fulfilling the current year's plans and socialist pledges, progress in the modernization and retooling of production, and the volumes of production of various consumer goods and food products and of construction of housing and social, cultural, and consumer facilities.

Many questions of social development, which have accumulated to a considerable extent in recent years in this city of many millions of people, are being resolved more fully than before, he noted. Here too there is the problem of providing all Muscovites with individual apartments by the year 2000, chronically overloaded transportation, and the low standard of trade and consumer services.

The Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers have adopted a number of principled resolutions on strengthening the capital's infrastructure. We have now embarked on the elaboration of a general plan for the development of Moscow and Moscow Oblast through the year 2010 as an integrated national economic complex. This is a highly complex task.

A decision has been adopted on the reconstruction of the city's historic center. Here we are counting, not without justification, on the help of the fraternal countries and, of course, their capitals. For instance, our Polish friends have much experience in the comprehensive restoration of major city centers. We can also learn from the people of Berlin and Prague.

Or take the question of medical services. We are building many hospitals and clinics in new housing areas. But the health care facilities in old Moscow have been neglected. We will impose order in all of this.

Next year, the speaker went on, will be very complex for us. The Law on the State Enterprise (Association) will come into force. Many of the city's enterprises will work in the conditions of full economic accountability and self-financing, and the zone covered by state acceptance will be widened. More than 2,000 labor collective councils have already been elected in the capital. I wish to stress that they are not simply consultative organs. They are endowed with real, very important rights.

The CPSU Central Committee and local party, soviet, and economic organs are striving promptly to eliminate existing difficulties and help resolve questions of improving the financial position of enterprises and the balance between plans and material and technical supply and production capacities.

Special significance is attached to ensuring that all leaders and labor collectives understand clearly and in detail the nature of the economic restructuring, realize their responsibility for its results, and become the masters of production in practice.

The introduction of economic methods of management is making us seriously set about reducing superfluous components and restructuring the activity of ministries and central economic departments. Finding work for the apparatus workers thus released is also the concern of the city party organization.

Great significance is attached to the clearer delimitation of the functions of party and soviet organs and the enhancement of the role and responsibility of the soviets of people's deputies for the state of affairs in the city. In this connection we plan to change the structure of the management of the city's economy, making it simpler and more flexible.

We see an effective means of resolving the urgent tasks in increasing the role of the rayon component, expanding the autonomy of party raykoms and rayispolkoms, and strengthening their responsibility for the state of affairs.

We consider it particularly important in the conditions of the restructuring to collect together literally every fragment of leading experience of party work, disseminate it skillfully, and increase the cadres' competence.

Here we are not simply using, but are filling with new content and detail many tried and tested forms of party work—seminars, including those involving raykom first secretaries, and universal economic education. We are expanding admissions to the Moscow Higher Party School, and from the new year, at the CPSU Central Committee Social Sciences Academy, we are beginning special courses in the methods of party work in the new economic conditions. The regular certification of party cadres has become systematic.

Ideological and political education work now requires keen attention and a creative reexamination of the forms and, I would say, an appeal to everyone. The wave of democratization of our society is bringing to the surface many negative phenomena too, especially among young people. We believe that the party committees and trade union and Komsomol organizations are not yet doing enough here. In the course of our meeting we will, I am sure, be able to enrich one another with experience of ideological work in the new conditions.

In our work we proceed on the basis that the success of the restructuring depends on the energy, purposefulness, and force of example of the party and every Communist. The interests of the cause of renewal require a resolute end to political and organizational sluggishness and lack of initiative on the part of those party committees which are still characterized by these shortcomings. Particular emphasis is placed on increasing the activeness of the primary party organizations, where all the threads of the transformations come together.

That is how the Moscow CPSU Gorkom is now organizing its work, having begun active preparations for the 19th All-Union Party Conference. This, as you know, is to take place next June.

We regard the holding of party committee plenums and Communists' meetings to discuss the reports of elected organs on the leadership of restructuring as an important stage in these preparations. It is necessary to evaluate searchingly the real progress in the economic, social, and spiritual spheres, uncover the existing shortcomings and mistakes, and determine how and on what basis to boost our work and give full scope to the Communists' initiative.

In the conditions of the launching of new, often complex processes in the country in connection with the restructuring, it is extremely important to display revolutionary restraint and not give in to difficulties, and to find the optimum solutions to the tasks posed by life. It is necessary to learn as we go along, so to speak, to overcome such harmful survivals as lack of initiative, lack of responsibility, incompetence, and the substitution of bureaucratic ruses for real action.

However, it is equally impermissible to give way to pressure from those excessively zealous and impatient figures who cannot or will not reckon with the objective logic of the restructuring, who would like artificially to spur on the transformations and force the pace, and to secure at all costs a pretext for reporting imaginary "successes."

The consequences of such approaches and methods in the past are sufficiently well-known. The history of socialism teaches us that any forcing of the pace or skipping of stages inevitably leads to the preservation of administrative decree methods of management, which are the main component of the braking mechanism. That mechanism is, unfortunately, tenacious. We must therefore combat it together.

The party, soviet, trade union, and youth organizations and labor collectives of Moscow maintain and develop ties with corresponding organizations in the capitals of the fraternal socialist countries. We seek to make these contacts really direct, and therefore more effective and fruitful in real terms. Another form of international ties, the holding of festivals devoted to the fraternal countries' capitals, is also successful.

This year long-term treaties have been signed on cooperation and the development of new forms of foreign economic and scientific and technical integration. On the basis of intergovernmental agreements being implemented in accordance with the Comprehensive Program for Scientific and Technical Progress of the CEMA Countries, 111 Moscow enterprises and organizations have been designated to exercise direct ties and take part in the creation of joint enterprises with partners in the socialist countries' capitals.

At the same time we see great reserves for increasing the effectiveness of these ties. A promising prospect is the holding of multilateral meetings and consultations to exchange experience on such questions as the practice of party leadership of the economy under full economic accountability and self-financing, ideological and party organizational work in the conditions of the development of glasnost and democracy, and experience in the use of the cooperative sector better to satisfy the working people's needs.

Concluding his speech, the speaker detailed these proposals. In particular, the idea of expanding, in future, the range of participants in such business meetings was put forward.

This meeting of ours, L.N. Zaykov said in conclusion, will lay good foundations for closer collaboration between the capitals' party organizations in fulfilling the tasks now facing each of our parties and the socialist community as a whole.

The participants in the meeting were received by W. Jaruzelski, first secretary of the PZPR Central Committee and chairman of the Polish State Council. Also taking part in the frank, comradely talk were the ambassadors of Bulgaria, Hungary, the GDR, the USSR, and the CSSR to Poland.

On the same day, the envoys of the party organizations of the fraternal countries' capitals laid flowers at the monument to the heroes of Warsaw. [passage omitted]

Jaruzelski Receives Zaykov

PM151129 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Dec 87 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Developing Fruitful Ties"]

[Text] Warsaw, 13 Dec—In a spirit of comradely frankness, to the point [konkretno], and in businesslike fashion, participants in a meeting of leaders of socialist countries' capital city party organizations, which is underway here, discussed tasks in stepping up efforts to accelerate the processes of cardinal transformations. For 2 days a constructive dialogue was held here which reflected, in accordance with the lines of the fraternal party congresses, the enhanced role of party organizations in the solution of topical tasks of socialist building.

It was noted at the conference that capital city party organizations face particularly responsible tasks. They are to play an important role in the profound restructuring of all spheres of social life.

Particular importance attaches to this work under the conditions of the expansion of socialist democracy, the implementation of radical economic transformations, and the growing political and labor activeness of the masses. The meeting's participants described how capital party organizations in Bulgaria, Hungary, the GDR, Poland, the USSR, and Czechoslovakia are doing their utmost in order to channel people's energy into resolutely overcoming everything that is still hampering progress.

This constructive and creative effort has been given a new impetus now when, thanks to the efforts of the USSR and the fraternal socialist countries, an important historic step has been taken on the road toward a world without wars with the signing of the Soviet-American Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles.

It was emphasized that this triumph of the peace-loving policy reflects the socialist countries' great contribution to the improvement of the international climate and testifies to the fact that the relations between them are developing and strengthening and have reached a qualitatively new level. The meeting's participants noted the need for the further deepening of all-around cooperation between the fraternal capitals' party organizations.

There are many facets to this work. Direct ties between labor collectives, public organizations, and scientific and cultural establishments are called upon to play an important role and the constant generalization of the experience accumulated in all spheres of political and economic life represents the party organizations' great reserve. This experience must be attentively studied and efforts must be made to turn it into a common asset, the meeting participants said.

The usefulness of this kind of meeting was noted more than once and proposals were put forward to hold such meetings regularly and to extend the circle of participants. This is reflected in the communique which was adopted on the results of the meeting.

L.N. Zaykov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Moscow party gorkom, met with W. Jaruzelski, first secretary of the PZPR Central Committee and chairman of the Polish State Council.

During a comradely conversation, the great importance was noted of the results of the talks between the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and the U.S. President and the signing of the Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles.

M.S. Gorbachev's personal contribution, his persistence, his flexible, constructive approach, and his will to achieve the noble aim which is important for the fate of all mankind were emphasized in particular. The Berlin meeting of Warsaw Pact leaders reaffirmed the qualitatively new level of relations between the socialist community countries which are marked by a spirit of comradely support, openness, and constructiveness.

The importance of the further collaboration between the USSR and Poland in the international arena with the aim of ensuring lasting peace, arms reduction, and a depening of trust in the continent of Europe and throughout the world was noted.

L.N. Zaykov and W. Jaruzelski briefed each other on the progress of the implementation of the two fraternal parties' tasks ensuing from the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the 10th PZPR Congress. The similarity of the aims of the restructuring in the USSR and the socialist renewal in Poland was emphasized.

Special attention was paid to the deepening of cooperation between the two parties and countries in the political and socioeconomic sphere. This cooperation is embodied in increasingly close collaboration in the national economic sphere. It is necessary to deepen the processes of production sharing and specialization, accelerate the establishment of joint enterprises, and exploit all reserves for the fulfillment of the tasks defined in the Comprehensive Program for CEMA Countries' Scientific and Technical Progress Through the Year 2000.

L.N. Zaykov had talks with J. Czyrek and M. Wozniak, members of the Politburo and secretaries of the PZPR Central Committee.

Secretaries Meeting Ends

LD131906 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 13 Dec 87

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The meeting of first secretaries of city party committees of the capital cities of the socialist countries ended in Warsaw today. Comrade Zaykov took part in the meeting. There was an exchange of the experience of the work of the party organizations of Berlin, Budapest, Warsaw, Moscow, Prague, and Sofia relating to the decisions of their party congresses. Topical tasks of speeding up the process of transformations in the political and socioeconomic life of capital cities were discussed. The leaders of the capital city party organizations greeted with great pleasure the signing by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and the U.S. President of the Treaty Eliminating Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles.

The meeting of first secretaries of the party committees of Berlin, Budapest, Warsaw, Moscow, Prague, and Sofia was businesslike and frank [otkrovennyy] in nature and reflected the concern for more effective solution of the vital problems of the labor and life of the populations of the friendly capitals, and for stepping up the activity of party organizations in the struggle to overcome the negative manifestations holding back the rate of advance.

The participants advocated that such meetings should be held regularly and that the circle of participants should be expanded.

Comrade Zaykov left Warsaw for Moscow today.

Slyunkov Meets Returning Zaykov

PM151531 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Dec 87 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Return to Moscow"]

[Excerpts] Warsaw, 13 Dec—L.N. Zaykov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of Moscow CPSU Gorkom, left Warsaw for Moscow today after attending the meeting of first secretaries of socialist countries' capital city party committees. [passage omitted]

On the same day L.N. Zaykov arrived in Moscow.

He was met at the airport by N.N. Slyunkov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and other officials.

J. Smolinsky, Polish charge d'affaires ad interim in the USSR, was also in the welcoming party.

Trade Minister on CEMA Trade Agreements

LD141343 Moscow World Service in English 1200 GMT 14 Dec 87

[Text] The Soviet foreign trade minister, Boris Aristov, has said that agreements on trade for next year have been signed with most of the Soviet Union's partners in the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance. Members of the organization are 10 socialist countries of Europe, Asia and America. The minister also pointed out that next year there will be a much bigger mutual exchange of equipment produced by the countries of the socialist community on the basis of international division of labor. Scores of new joint enterprises will also be set up.

Further on Pyadyshev 15 Dec Media Conference

USSR INF Ratification Process

LD151900 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 15 Dec 87

[Excerpt] [Announcer] [Passage omitted] When and how will ratification of the INF treaty be conducted in the USSR? This question was answered today at a briefing at the press center of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs by Boris Dmitriyevich Pyadyshev, member of the Collegium of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. This is what he said:

[Begin Pyadyshev recording] The procedure for ratifiying the Treaty on Eliminating Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles in the Soviet Union is as follows: The USSR Council of Ministers has the first word. First, this treaty is examined at the USSR Council of Ministers. It will prepare appropriate proposals on the treaty, and after these proposals have been adopted the treaty is passed to the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. On instruction of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, the foreign affairs commissions of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities will examine the treaty that has been submitted for ratification on a preliminary basis and give the appropriate conclusions.

The decision of the Supreme Soviet Presidium on the ratification of the treaty is adopted in the form of a decree. On the basis of the decree on ratification, a ratification certificate is signed by the chairman of the Presidium. According to an agreement between the Soviet and the U.S. sides an exchange of the ratification certificates is then carried out.

I shall remind you that in the U.S. Congress the beginning of the ratification process has been set for 19 January 1988. Evidently we shall be following parallel courses here. As we all heard in Mikhail Sergeyevich's statement yesterday, the Supreme Soviet will do its utmost to approve this truly historic treaty and ratify it. [end recording]

Envoys To Explain Summit Results

LD151447 Moscow TASS in English 1431 GMT 15 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 15 TASS—At every stage of preparation for and working out of the Treaty of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, the Soviet Union acted in close cooperation with fraternal allied Warsaw Treaty states, with other socialist states, with democratic trends and movements, USSR Foreign Ministry Spokesman Boris Pyadyshev said at a briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists today.

The USSR intends to continue acting in the same collectivist spirit, the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman noted. Of much importance in this respect is the meeting of leaders of the Warsaw Treaty member-states held on December 11 in Berlin. At that meeting, Mikhail Gorbachev within hours after the conclusion of the Washington talks informed the colleagues in the Warsaw Treaty of the fundamental results of the talks in Washington. All the leaders of allied states unanimously supported the results of the Washington talks, Boris Pyadyshev said. Addressing a national conference of the Romanian Communist Party in Bucharest these days, Nicolae Ceausescu described the signing of the treaty as an event of worldwide historic importance and expressed cordial congratulations for Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan.

The USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman noted that an extensive exchange of opinions on the results of the Washington meeting will be continued in different directions and on different levels. A substantial conversation was held these days in Bonn between Viktor Karpov who was visiting there as special representative of the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and FRG Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher. This conversation was viewed with satisfaction in Moscow. At that conversation, Genscher stressed that the signing of the treaty is of historic importance and positively assessed the policy of the USSR whose leadership is acting in accordance with new political thinking.

Today, tomorrow and on subsequent days, practically all USSR deputy foreign ministers, other high officials of the USSR Foreign Ministry will visit 44 countries in every continent to conduct conversations in connection with the Washington talks, the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman noted. Ambassador at large Alexey Obukhov already visited Cuba and had a meeting with Fidel Castro. Vladimir Petrovskiy leaves for India, Anatoliy Adamishin for Japan, Viktor Komplektov will visit Mexico, Argentina and Brazil, Vadim Loginov—Yugoslavia, Greece and Cyprus, Valentin Nikiforov will go to Finland, Igor Rogachev will visit the PRC, DPRK and Mongolia, Boris Chaplin—the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, the Lao People's Democratic Republic and the People's Republic of Kampuchea.

They have different routes but the same goal—to promote the creation of a favourable atmosphere for the advance along the road of the arrangements reached in Washington, the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman said.

Next U.S.-Soviet Summit Date

LD152201 Belgrade TANJUG in English 2035 GMT 15 Dec 87

[Excerpt] Moscow, December 15 (TANJUG)—The next Soviet-U.S. summit is planned to take place in May or June next year, as the first deputy head of the Soviet Foreign Ministry Press Department Boris Pyadishev told a news conference in Moscow today.

Until the next summit, as Pyadishev said, the delegations of the two countries at the Geneva arms talks are to prepare a platform for a new agreement on the reduction of offensive nuclear weapons by 50 percent.

The Geneva arms talks are to resume next January. [passage omitted]

Discusses Arab-Israeli Conflict

LD151516 Moscow TASS in English 1500 GMT 15 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 15 TASS—Statements in favour of peace and the establishment of civilized relations with Arab neighbours often coming from Israel are at variance with repressions against Palestinians, the shooting of defenseless people and other actions in the spirit of state terrorism. This was stated at a briefing today by Boris Pyadyshev, spokesman for the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, when he answered questions from journalists.

"The latest developments in the Israeli-occupied Arab lands show that the Middle East conflict continues to be one of the most acute international problems calling for a instant settlement. It is necessary to promote the quest for ways to settle the Arab-Israeli conflict as soon as possible through the convocation of an international peaceful conference with equal participation of all the parties concerned, including the Palestine Liberation Organization and member states of the U.N. Security Council", he said. Pyadyshev emphasized that it was the only way to ensure durable peace and security for all the nations of the Middle East.

Lauds Jordan's Middle East Role

LD151459 Moscow TASS in English 1420 GMT 15 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 15 TASS—"The coming visit to the USSR of King Husayn of Jordan is of much importance", Boris Pyadyshev, spokesman for the ministry of foreign affairs, said today [words indistinct] for Soviet and foreign journalists.

He pointed out that the USSR maintained rather good relations with Jordan both in the political and economic spheres. Moscow appreciates the role played by Jordan in the Middle East process, as well as the efforts of the King of Jordan and the Jordanian leadership aimed at defusing the Middle East situation. "We see that Jordan is playing an important part in a whole range of extremely complicated Palestinian and [word indistinct] Palestinian relations. this is why a Soviet-Jordanian dialogue can be constructive, intense and useful for both sides and for the situation in the Middle East region", Pyadyshev said.

Concern Over U.S. Gulf Presence

LD151454 Moscow TASS in English 1451 GMT 15 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 15 TASS—The Soviet Union is seriously concerned over the developments of events in the Persian Gulf, Boris Pyadyshev, a spokesman for the USSR Foreign Ministry, told a news briefing here today. In addition to the Iran-Iraq war which is a serious moment by itself, we are alarmed by the continuing and in some relations growing military presence of the USA in the Gulf. Dozens of U.S. Naval vessels are currently there. As for the Soviet military presence, we have only three mine sweepers, an auxiliary vessel and two escort ships. With the massive military presence of the USA continuing in the Gulf, the Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman said, the tensions in this region will be hardly reduced.

New moments are likely to emerge in the diplomatic activity on the problem of the Iranian-Iraqi conflict in the near future, Boris Pyadyshev said. The Soviet Union has received a message from the U.N. Secretary General Perez de Cuellar, saying that his mission has practically exhausted itself. What should be done today is for the Security Council, its permament members to ask Iran and Iraq once more to stop the fratricidal and senseless war.

Chervov Explains Japanese Air Space Intrusion

LD152018 Moscow TASS in English 2000 GMT 15 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 15 TASS—A TASS diplomatic correspondent reports:

Colonel General Nikolay Chervov, chief of a department of the General Staff of the Armed Forces of the Soviet Union, met with a group of Japanese journalists at the Press Centre of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs today, and answered their questions about the Soviet TU-16 combat aircraft which had violated Japan's air space in the area of Okinawa island on December 9.

"The main cause of the incident was that all navigation equipment of the aircraft failed, and so the pilot flew the aircraft in a blind flight, visually", General Chervov said. "This happened in the area of Bashi channel from where the aircraft could not return to base because it would have run out of fuel. Then the two-man crew decided to continue the flight to an alternate airfield in the area of Vladivostok".

"The flight was made in complex weather conditions which increased the possibility of violating the air space of a foreign state. During the encounter with Japanese fighter planes which scrambled to meet the TU-16, the Soviet pilot proved disoriented", Nikolay Chervov said. "Instead of turning to the left, he turned to the right, aggravating the violation of Japan's air space. It was only when the pilot visually discovered that he was over Okinawa the aircraft made an abrupt turn to the left, heading for the alternate airfield".

"The Soviet Government regrets the incident and offered appropriate apologies to the Japanese side".

General Chervov told the journalists that the two Soviet pilots had not noticed the warning signal shots fired by the Japanese fighter planes but only paid attention to the rocking of wings—the sign of violation of air space. Upon making sure that the navigation equipment had failed, the Soviet pilots had sent a distress signal—this is evidenced by the existing record of the talks between the pilots. General Chervov emphasised that in the situation in which the Soviet combat aircraft had found itself, the air border of any state could be violated.

The general pointed out that the pilots of the TU-16 would be subjected to a strict disciplinary penalty.

In conclusion of the talk with the Japanese journalists, General Chervov, who had just returned from Washington where he had stayed among the group of Soviet experts, emphasised that the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles was of immense importance not only to the Soviet Union and the United States but also to other countries, including those in the Asia-Pacific region.

Moscow Forum on Socialism Ends 10 Dec

PM141137 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Dec 87 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Frank, Committed Dialogue"]

[Text] As one of the participants in the international scientific conference "Great October and the Present Day" acknowledged, the new thinking has really entered the international arena: Just as in the past the word "sputnik" became familiar to the whole world, so today everyone knows "perestroyka" and "glasnost." These concepts, which have become symbols of the new era, formed the background to the discussions of this representative forum, that ended in Moscow 10 December. The work was conducted in three sections under the leadership of G. L. Smirnov, director of the CPSU Central Committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism, R. G. Yanovskiy, rector of the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences, and P. N. Fedoseyev, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

The remarkable feature of all the sessions was the activeness displayed by social democratic representatives. An example of that was provided by the speech of I. Papadatos, member of the Panhellenic Socialist Movement (PASOK) Central Committee, who considered that the causes of the split of the left-wing movement in Europe no longer exist. A frank and deeper dialogue, he stated, can create the ideological and political basis for the formation of a new front of left-wing forces in Europe. Such an amalgamation will make it possible to begin a broad exchange of opinions with the European socialist countries with the prospect in the future of a united and pluralist Europe stretching from the Atlantic to the Urals and from the Baltic to the Mediterranean.

However, by no means did all the participants in the discussion agree with such a broad interpretation of cooperation. Many considered the socialists' position somewhat one-sided and noted that it amounts to proposing that the European socialist countries adopt the bourgeois parliamentary system pertaining to the West. Doubt was expressed at the conference on the validity of transplanting social democratic pluralism to socialist soil, a pluralism which has so far not changed the bases of the capitalist system but, on the contrary, has adapted to it. Note was made here of the importance of the comprehensive development of the instruments of socialist democracy—glasnost, criticism, and monitoring.

There was a lively discussion on the ways to improve socialism at the sessions of the forum's second section. The analysis centered not only on the achievements. There was also a discussion of the phenomena that have caused considerable harm to the cause and image of socialism, such as the discrepancy between the principles of the socialist system and the everyday reality, negative processes in the economy, anomalies in the social and spiritual-moral spheres, and the cult of personality.

R.G. Yanovskiy spoke about the need for a complete understanding of the crucial problems in all spheres of social relations. He drew attention to the basic characteristics of the qualitatively new state of the socialist countries which will be achieved during restructuring. In his paper the scientist pointed to the phenomena of the spontaneous and the conscious in socialist building, as well as the danger of replacing the scientific evaluation of the processes of socialist development with voluntarist and subjectivist notions about them.

Heated debates accompanied the discussion of the modern concepts of the class struggle and the principles of peaceful coexistence; the causes of the current weakening of the influence of the communist parties in West Europe; the humanization of the socioeconomic, political, and spiritual spheres of socialist society's life; and the acute problems of the developing world. There were a number of graphic reports marked by a fresh and innovative approach based on the speakers' belief in their own correctness without, however, laying claim to be the ultimate authority on the truth.

Nevertheless, the conference was dominated by the desire to achieve mutual understanding and find a common moral denominator of collaboration among political and scientific forces whose world outlooks do not coincide. This was shown particularly graphically during the discussion on questions of the struggle for the preservation of peace on earth. The conference participants were unanimous in the opinion that the elimination of two classes of nuclear weapons will increase security not only on the European Continent but throughout the world.

The overwhelming majority of conference participants sees in the signing of the treaty the shoots of the new political thinking and the mutual desire of the two great powers to soberly consider the interests of all countries—large and small. In their opinion, the factors which make the Soviet-U.S. treaty historic are its psychological and moral potential. It was thus natural that the forum participants responded keenly and positively to the ideas expressed by M.S. Gorbachev during the meeting with the U.S. public on the need for a more moral policy based on a knowledge and, most important, an understanding of the realities of today's interconnected world.

The evening plenary session summed up the results of the work of the conference, in which 120 scientists and social figures from 65 countries participated. The conference was organized by a number of academic and scientific institutions under the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Academy of Sciences.

V. Yakovlev Views Soviet, World Human Rights

PM141519 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Dec 87 Morning Edition p4

[Interview with Professor V.F. Yakovlev, director of the All-Union Scientific Research Institute of Soviet Legislation, by IZVESTIYA correspondent A. Ivanko: "Finding a Constructive Approach"; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] Every year on 10 December the world celebrates Human Rights Day. With what is the origin of this connected? Almost 40 years ago, in 1948, the United Nations approved the Universal Declaration on Human Rights—a most important international legal act designed, as indicated in the UN Charter, to "reestablish faith in basic human rights, the dignity and value of human life, equality between the sexes, and equal rights for nations large and small."

"This year Human Rights Day coincided—and this is deeply symbolic—with M.S. Gorbachev's visit to the United States and the summit meeting," Professor V.F. Yakovlev, director of the All-Union Scientific Research Institute of Soviet Legislation, said in an interview with IZVESTIYA correspondent A. Ivanko. "After all, when it comes down to it, the summit meeting is dedicated to global humanitarian problems and human rights, especially the most basic right of all—the right to life. A policy of disarmament is a guarantee of this right. For our society, humanitarian problems and human rights and freedoms are taken very much to heart. We are living at a time of restructuring every aspect of social life, which is intended to establish the Leninist essence of socialism: democracy, humanism, and the individual.

"The Soviet Union is signatory to 12 very important international agreements on humanitarian problems, primarily the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, and the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women. In January 1987 the USSR acceded the UN Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman, or Degrading Forms of Treatment and Punishment. We are currently studying a number of other conventions and considering the possibilities of joining them, working on the premise that they must be positive in their substance.

"We attach great importance to implementation of the Helsinki Final Act. The USSR Constitution incorporates all 10 of its principles. Serious work is in progress in our country to improve internal legislation. The Law on Citizenship was ratified in 1978 and, in 1981, the Law on the Legal Status of Foreign Citizens in the USSR. The most important legislative instruments recently ratified include the Law on the Nationwide Discussion of Important Issues of State Life, the Law on the Procedure of Appeal Against Unlawful Actions by Officials Encroaching on Citizens' Rights, and the Law on Individual Labor Activity. The trend toward broadening Soviet citizens' political, socioeconomic, and civil rights is inherent in them all. Legislative instruments are currently being drafted to improve criminal legislation in order to make it more humane and also legislation governing criminal proceedings with the aim of increasing the potential to exercise the right of defense.

"Moving onto the international aspects of human rights, I must point out that many confrontational elements have been introduced to humanitarian issues and human rights, and that there is sometimes unwarranted sensationalism—and more often than not it is our society that is the target of propaganda attacks. Attempts are made to depreciate the indisputable achievements of the Soviet working people with regard to political, socioeconomic, and civil rights. Attention is focused on individual phenomena and processes taken out of the general context which are not even the most important or the most significant. The West makes a great deal of fuss about entry to and exit from the Soviet Union. Meanwhile these issues are decided in our country in line with the Final Act and on the basis of our legislation, which we have a right to pass.

"In the human rights sphere we are constantly being presented with a list of charges, but we could, if we wanted, present an even longer list of charges ourselves. The United States, for example, is signatory to very few international agreements concerning human rights and, what is more, it avoids acceding to virtually every fundamental agreement. It has not associated itself with international pacts on human rights and conventions to eliminate racial discrimination and discrimination against various women's rights. It does not take part in the activity of the relevant international bodies concerned with these conventions. At the same time the United States has unilaterally assumed the right to assess the human rights situation in other countries.

"We see this in particular as an attempt to avoid solving its own problems connected with guaranteeing fundamental human rights, such as the right to life, for example. This right incorporates a great deal: the right to employment, the right to housing, the right to personal security against all criminal offences.

"Too many confrontational elements have built up in humanitarian and human rights issues. Should we not give greater attention to a positive, constructive approach in this serious matter? One sign of this kind of approach is the establishment of a Soviet public commission on international cooperation (I would like to emphasize the word "cooperation") in humanitarian problems and human rights, this commission being part of the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation, of which I am deputy chairman. Preparatory work is under way to set up a Soviet committee on humanitarian problems and human rights.

"I would like to hope that a constructive approach to humanitarian problems and human rights will gradually replace the confrontational approach. People all over the world will benefit from this."

'Indelible Effect' of Summit Hailed

PM141251 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Dec 87 Second Edition pp 1, 5

[Special correspondents V. Gan, Ye. Grigoryev, and T. Kolesnichenko dispatch: "Indelible Effect"]

[Text] Washington, 12 Dec—The black, rain-laden sky above Washington swiftly swallowed the navigational lights of the Il-62 which took off from Andrews Air Force Base in the United States. The sound of its engines rolled over the ground and died away, as if drawing a line beneath the unusual days experienced by the U.S. capital and by the whole world. The USSR-U.S. summit meeting had become part of history, one of its qualitatively new pages filled with people's optimism and hopes.

It has long been known that it is easier to see the big picture from a distance. This is really true. But something else, which is already absolutely clear, is also true: A major event in world politics had taken place. Two great powers, the mightiest powers on our planet, had found a new way to conduct their complex, tangled, and contradictory relations. There was a demonstration of both sides' desire to advance, no matter how hard it may be, toward the elimination of differences.

The Soviet-U.S. meeting is over. Now is the time for analysis. And hundreds of political scientists and journalists, as well as the public, are already busy at it. It seems that no one remained indifferent to the talks and their results. THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR was correct in remarking: "Everyone is talking not only about accords in the arms control sphere but also about a possible new era in USSR-U.S. relations." This is not just a journalist's conclusion. According to an opinion poll just conducted by ABC-TV, 76% of Americans share exactly the same opinion, believing that expansion of dialogue and deepening of mutual understanding and cooperation are feasible.

There is much food for thought. Approaching the negotiating table with a readiness to find a solution to existing problems, the sides achieved substantial shifts on the question of boosting strategic stability and reducing the danger of the outbreak of conflicts. It was recognized at the highest level by both states that they are at the exist from protracted confrontation. In the Soviet-U.S. joint statement adopted in Washington, the sides essentially pledged to collaborate in building a safer world. This is a timeless commitment and has been given before the entire world, which is tired of living under the permanent threat of a nuclear cataclysm.

The Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles signed at the meeting is an unprecedented step along this avenue, an event on a historic scale. In terms of both its objective—the destruction of an entire class of USSR and U.S. nuclear arms—and its verification measures, it lays the foundations for a radically new approach to the solution of disarmament problems.

This is a fact that is increasingly gaining recognition here among the broadest circles, even among those who, until quite recently, were in opposition to this kind of agreement.

Some remarkable data were cited by ABC-TV in this context: While the agreement on medium- and shorter-range missiles was backed by 52% of Americans prior to the Washington meeting, this indicator rose to 71% after the talks.

The public's mood would thus seem to be obvious. And what about the Senate, which now has to ratify the treaty? Reports from Capitol Hill make it possible to speak of support for the treaty by the overwhelming majority of legislators.

In his address to the nation, President Reagan described the treaty as "a step which could be the most important since World War II." Given all the grounds for this remark, it would hardly be a mistake to say that the agreement is an interim step, a kind of prelude to the solution of the central question in Soviet-U.S. relations, which is the reduction of strategic arms. It is well-known that a significant advance was also achieved in this sphere.

Nobody is playing down the amount of work that still remains to be done. Both sides will have to work long and hard. But the foundation for constructive results has already been laid by the participants in the meeting. "The reduction of strategic weapons is indeed an important objective. It is necessary to make it impossible for the United States and the USSR to gain any advantage in first-strike potential, it is necessary to stabilize universal security," according to Senator A. Gore, one of the Democratic Party White House hopefuls. His words reflect an opinion that is fairly widely held here. Incidentally, according to poll data, 57% of Americans are firmly in support of the idea of reducing strategic offensive arms.

The combination of realism, mutual desire, and the readiness to move toward one another ensured progress. And here is something typical: Not a single serious expert or observer is talking about unilateral concessions by either party. On the contrary, everyone is noting the mutually acceptable nature of the compromises, which are the only things that can bring this major objective within reach.

The question of elaborating an accord which would pledge both the Soviet and the U.S. side to observe the ABM Treaty in the form in which it was signed in 1972 and not to withdraw from this treaty for an agreed on period was examined in this very same key. In other words, even though the problem of preventing the militarization of space—one of the most important and most complex—was not exhaustively solved, there was progress in the quest for accord. The serious nature of both sides' intention, as revealed by the meeting, gives ground for hoping that existing differences will ultimately be overcome. And it was no accident that THE WASHINGTON POST wrote: "Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan essentially spoke the same language of hope and optimism."

Indeed, the newspaper may be right in its assumption, because the two leaders' hopes and optimism really were similar. There was an equally similar readiness to recognize differences in views and positions. You cannot solve everything at once, but the desire to diminish confrontation—be it on the subject of conventional arms, chemical weapons, nuclear tests, or regional conflicts—is capable of taking us out of the labyrinth of disagreement. The many years of confrontation and acute rivalry have brought nothing but harm. The USSR and the United States are world powers with great economic, intellectual, and military potential. Their weight in international affairs is enormous. This determines their role and their responsibility.

Many newspapers are now writing that "political awareness of the realities has been awakened" in Washington. What are the grounds for such a conclusion? The fact that a remarkable dialogue ensued. As well as its results. "The changes are striking," as THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR, for example, pointed out.

There is no exaggeration in this assessment. The 3 days of talks were a powerful spur to the display of political wisdom and the new political thinking. They hold the key to preserving life on earth. It is, after all, no secret that politicians lag behind the mood of the peoples, who yearn for an end to confrontation and discord.

We were convinced of this time and again while observing this most important event in international life hour by hour and day by day. People were literally holding a vigil in the streets in order to catch just a single personal glimpse of the USSR and U.S. leaders. Expressions of the desire to develop mutual understanding, friendship, and all-around contacts at all levels and in all spheres were invariably heard at M.S. Gorbachev's meetings with representatives of the news media and the business world, scientists and artists, and young people. The goodwill displayed by Americans was unambiguous proof that they are in favor of an improvement in relations which is urgently needed by our peoples and the whole world.

"That was a historic week which will certainly be remembered by everyone," the ABC-TV anchorman said in a program showing yet again the human, moving moments of the visit by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee on U.S. soil. Handshakes and smiles shone from the screens. It was evident that this is the one and only way for contacts between people linked by a common destiny on one and the same planet.

Ponomarev Hails INF Pact, Seeks Further Moves

PM141607 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 13 Dec 87 Second Edition p 3

[Observer Manki Ponomarev "Military-Political Review": "Reason Triumphing"]

[Text] There are days when time seems condensed to the limit. Such were the days of the official Washington visit of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and his talks with U.S. President R. Reagan. Talks, meetings, and exchanges of opinions followed each other in an unbroken sequence.

Speaking at the official welcoming ceremony at the White House, the Soviet leader said: "Much in world development will depend on the choice we make today and on what prevails: the fears and prejudices inherited from the 'cold war,' which lead to confrontation, or common sense, which calls for actions in the interests of civilization's survival." Today we have every reason to claim that common sense has triumphed. The Washington summit meeting has justified the peoples' hopes.

Much was done in the course of a businesslike and frank discussion of cardinal problems of Soviet-U.S. relations and urgent aspects of the world situation. While not belittling the great political and ideological distances separating the Soviet Union and the United States, participants in the talks sought and, as a rule, found or outlined paths of rapprochement in those channels, where this is vitally necessary both for the two countries and for all mankind. There was a useful exchange of opinions, for example, enabling them to ascertain each other's positions with regard to regional conflicts and development of bilateral ties and on human rights. The speedy attainment of specific decisions which will suit both the USSR and the United States and other countries may be expected here with regard to certain aspects.

It is possible to claim without a doubt that the exchange of opinions on the future of Soviet-U.S. relations was a substantial result of the Washington talks, as though defining the agenda for joint work in the future. This is undoubtedly of constructive significance and lends predictability to the dialogue between the Soviet Union and the United States. There is no denying that such predictability has been in very short supply in recent years.

There is every reason to hope that it will now increase. Particularly important here is the conviction solemnly proclaimed by the two countries' leaders that nuclear war must never be unleashed and their statement of resolve to prevent any war between the USSR and the United States—nuclear or conventional—and to stop seeking military superiority.

The signing of the treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles was of significance to all mankind both from the viewpoint of world politics and from the viewpoint of humanism. It is a treaty under which the two greatest powers in the military-strategic respect have pledged to destroy in practice a part of their nuclear weapons. The process of nuclear disarmament has thereby been started.

The signing of this treaty makes it possible to conclude that the Washington meeting of the Soviet and U.S. leaders marked a new stage in development of relations between our two countries. The potential for nuclear disarmament which was, so to speak, comprehended and in some respects even calculated at the Reykjavik meeting is now beginning to be materialized for the first time. It is precisely this that enables us to speak of a qualitative shift in Soviet-U.S. r[illegible]ns, at the core of which lie problems of securit[illegible]

According to the [illegible] medium-range missiles of the two sides are [illegible] over 3 years: 826 Soviet SS-20, SS-4 [illegible] and 689 U.S. Pershing-2 and BGM [illegible]er-range missiles, the Soviet SS [illegible] S. Pershing-1A, are to be destro[illegible] while the U.S. nuclear warheads o[illegible] missiles belonging to the FRG will be [illegible] last 2 weeks of the said 3-year period.

On the whole, the Soviet Union is faced with destroying approximately 2,000 missiles of both classes, both deployed and stockpiled, while the United States is to destroy approximately 850. The Soviet Union is to eliminate roughly 2,500 nuclear warheads; the United States is to destroy 1,320. Various methods of destroying the missiles are envisaged: by burning the solid fuel, crushing, or blowing up with conventional explosives. Both countries also have the right to destroy a certain proportion of the missiles (not more than 100) by launching or firing them.

The treaty will be implemented under very strict control. Not only the elimination of missiles is being monitored. This monitoring will be supplemented by inspections on suspicion and also by inspection of production. These inspections will embrace not only the Soviet Union and the United States but also other states on that have medium- and shorter-range missiles on their territory. In short, never before has any other treaty, with regard to limiting or reducing arms, provided for such strict and profoundly elaborated verification measures as are defined in the Soviet-U.S. treaty signed in Washington 8 December. It is also important to point out that they can serve as a precedent in drawing up new Soviet-U.S. agreements aimed at reducing nuclear arms.

All this has made it possible to move forward to resolving the key problem of Soviet-U.S. relations and the central question of the process of delivering mankind from nuclear weapons. It is a question of a substantial reduction in strategic offensive arms, the mightiest weapons in the world. M.S. Gorbachev's talks with R. Reagan marked certain progress in resolving this task, although there is much work still to be done here.

Most importantly, clear guidelines have been outlined to be followed by both countries on the path to nuclear disarmament. The Soviet proposals are not confined to a 50% reduction in strategic offensive arms under conditions where both countries abide by the ABM Treaty for a mutually agreed upon time. In regard to preparing a treaty on strategic offensive arms, the two countries' leaders have entrusted their delegations in Geneva with elaborating an accord obliging the sides to observe the ABM Treaty in the form in which it was signed in the process of conducting research, development, and, where necessary, tests permitted by it and not to pull out of the ABM Treaty during the agreed upon time. What is more, CBS-TV has reported that the Soviet delegation has disseminated proposals for the elimination of all tactical nuclear arms by 1990, prohibition of space arms, also by 1990, phased destruction of all nuclear warheads by 1995, and, finally, complete nuclear disarmament by the year 2000. "Whether or not it is an unrealizable dream," CBS-TV correspondent W. Andrews declared with regard to these proposals, "this is precisely the USSR's plan."

The entire course of the Washington talks and the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting attest to the strength of the new political thinking. This has been confirmed by the Warsaw Pact states' leading figures, who met in Berlin 11 December in accordance with a mutual agreement. Expressing their peoples' will, they fully supported and highly evaluated the results of the Washington talks, regarding them as a step on a historic scale, which is already having a beneficial impact on the planet's political climate.

The accords reached in Washington also reinforce progress in other areas, leading to the curtailment of the arms race: prohibiting and eliminating chemical weapons, ending nuclear tests, and reducing armed forces and conventional arms in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals. Also of great significance is the readiness expressed by the allied socialist states at the Berlin meeting to keep within the limits of sufficiency necessary for defense and to resolve the problem of asymmetry and imbalances with regard to individual types of weapons by means of a reduction by the side which is ahead. The foreign ministers of the USSR, the GDR, and the CSSR signed an agreement on inspections in connection with the treaty between the USSR and the United States on eliminating their medium- and shorter-range missiles.

A positive assessment was also made of the results of the talks and the treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles at the NATO Council's Brussels session. Separate agreements were signed there Friday between the United States and its five West European allies on whose territory U.S. medium-range missiles have been sited or had been proposed to be sited. It provides for an end to all work, the missiles' withdrawal, and implementation of verification by the forces of Soviet military inspectors. In Belgium, the order to halt all work at the base in Florennes connected with preparations for the planned stationing of an additional 32 U.S. cruise missiles was issued just a few hours after the Soviet-U.S. treaty was signed in Washington. The implementation of the plan to station 48 U.S. cruise missiles in the Netherlands has also been halted. This can serve as good evidence of signs of realism in politics.

Today, elements of the new political thinking generally are being revealed even in those who only quite recently categorically rejected it. Speaking at Washington's Council for International Affairs, U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz declared, for example, that "at the present time of profound historic changes, the United States and the Soviet Union must make the maximum use of opportunities to restructure the confrontational nature of U.S.-Soviet relations in order to improve them in the interests of all the world's peoples." Pentagon leaders took the unprecedented step of inviting Marshal of the Soviet Union S.F. Akhromeyev, USSR first deputy defense minister, to the holy of holies of the U.S. Defense Department: the top-secret National Command Center.

The following fact has also attracted attention. For the first time in recent years, U.S. Defense Secretary F. Carlucci has ordered a reduction by almost $33 billion in the draft military budget for fiscal 1989, which had been prepared under his predecessor, C. Weinberger. On his orders, the Navy is to reduce spending by almost $12 billion, the Air Force by $10.5 billion, and the Army by $9 billion. It is proposed to cut or eliminate the programs for creation of MX and Midgetman missiles, new aircraft carriers, and new combat helicopters. At present, all these are still just projects. But they are symptomatic in their own way.

Assessing the results of the Washington summit meeting, some Western analysts put the question: Who won? M.S. Gorbachev remarked in this regard: "I reject this formulation of the question. It is an anachronism of the old thinking." It must be obvious to everyone that common sense won.

Yes, the old thinking is tenacious, and the most reactionary and militarist circles of Western countries do not intend to abandon it. But reason is triumphing. Maybe it is not yet the greatest victory. Nevertheless, it is very important, for it accords with the aspirations and interests of hundreds of millions of people on all continents. The new political thinking in action—this is how the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Washington and its results should be described.

Pasko Comments on Improved Relations

LD141914 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 14 Dec 87

[Text] According to a poll conducted by the ABC television network, 82% of Americans believe that the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting led to important achievements in relations between the two countries. Over to Vladimir Pasko, a commentator:

[Pasko] Ever since the 1970's public opinion polls carried out in the United States have testified to the fact that most Americans favor a freezing of nuclear arsenals and are against military rivalry with the Soviet Union. The Soviet-U.S. summit meeting demonstrated important shifts in this direction: The treaty eliminating medium- and shorter-range missiles, which was anyway the first practical step in the field of nuclear disarmament; significant progress on the issue of a real and radical reduction in strategic offensive weapons; a breakthrough on the issue of verification, described by both sides as extremely important. Although there was no visible progress in a number of respects, there is already enough to describe the meeting as very successful, whether from the point of view of a practical reduction in weapons as a worldwide problem or from the standpoint of bilateral Soviet-U.S. relations.

Here is an important point: In the final document the sides declared that they will continue to be guided by the convictions—so solemnly stated by them—that a nuclear war must never be unleashed, since there cannot be any victor in it. They are fully resolved to avert any war between the USSR and the United States, whether nuclear or conventional. They will not strive for nuclear superiority. This all sounds like a hopeful pledge that the sides—at the very least—will not retreat from the point reached. The words to the effect that the disagreements existing between the two countries are not an insuperable obstacle to progress in spheres of mutual interest show the real possibility for the development of Soviet-U.S. relations in an up-beat fashion.

It is acknowledged at the top level in both states that they have found a way out of the long drawn-out confrontation which they are ready to leave behind them. This is an important political outcome, and an important political statement, which is contained in the joint document. Herein lies the essence of the move to the new stage in Soviet-U.S. relations. In evaluating the past, it is impossible not to see that the many years of confrontation and of bitter rivalry between the USSR and the United States have brought nothing but harm. Both countries have proved that they can live without each other, but neither they nor the world derived any benefit from this. The awareness that it was necessary to put an end to confrontation and to begin a fresh stage in relations between the two countries was much in evidence during the meeting. But what must be done to achieve this? Speaking at a news conference in Washington, Comrade Gorbachev said: The Soviet leadership does not have two opinions. A firm decision has been reached: We are for a decisive improvement in relations with the United States of America. This is what our people need, and what the whole world needs.

If the opinion polls and the statements by political and public figures are anything to go by, with the exception of narrow groups, there are no opponents of this approach in the United States either. This permits us to say that if realistic steps follow the political declarations of the leadership, then Soviet-U.S. relations are in for better times.

Western Observers Trying To 'Minimize' Treaty

LD142134 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1540 GMT 14 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow, 14 Dec (TASS)—Vladimir Bogachev, a TASS observer on military matters, writes:

Observers in the United States and elsewhere are now trying to minimize the significance of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on Eliminating Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles by claiming, in particular, that since the agreement involves just 5% of the world's nuclear weapons, it will not have a stabilizing effect on the situation in Europe.

I believe the talk about the "small military significance" of the treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles is either erroneous or prejudiced. Claims by a number of NATO strategists that the removal of the U.S. missiles from Europe "will create a gap in Western Europe's defense, thus destabilizing the situation on the continent," are absolutely untenable.

The danger presented by one or another nuclear weapon class is determined in the context of the present day, not just—indeed not so much—by its total destructive power or by the number of nuclear warheads. For instance, the U.S. 'Pershing-2' medium-range missiles, which are subject to elimination under the treaty, are rightly considered extremely destabilizing weapons systems. Competent U.S. experts admit that these missiles are "particularly provocative weapons." Their very deployment at operational sites in the immediate vicinity of the socialist countries' borders is fraught with the threat of general nuclear war.

The point is that the flight time of the U.S.'Pershing-2' from bases in the FRG to the vital installations on socialist community territory is 8-12 minutes. This means that, once receiving an alarm of an incoming missile attack, the other side, the Soviet Union, would have literally 2-3 minutes to evaluate the authenticity of the alert and make a decision on how to respond in retaliation against the aggressor. Under such conditions, the risk of war rises sharply, particularly given defects in warning and communications technology. In other words, the probability is rising of an accidental or unintentional unleashing of a general nuclear war.

Furthermore, the scrapping of medium-range missiles in Europe will strike a serious blow to the U.S. concept of the so-called "limited nuclear war", in which Western Europe would be called on to play the role of lightning conductor, taking a retaliatory strike. The main means of unleashing this war were to have been the U.S. 'Pershings' and 'Tomahawks', which for a long time were known as 'Euromissiles'. The apologists for adventurist approaches to the issues of war and peace gambled on preparing for a nuclear war, to be conducted at considerable distance from U.S. shores, counting on the aggression to go unpunished. The U.S. 'Euromissiles' were cast as the fuse for a nuclear war.

These plans were extremely dangerous, not just for Europe, but also for the United States. To limit a nuclear war through some geographical limit is just as unrealistic as limiting the result of a burning match thrown into a powder keg.

Bilateral elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles will bring about an appreciable reduction in the level of military confrontation in Europe, and, most importantly, a sharp decrease in the risk of worldwide catastrophic nuclear war. It is in this vein that the military significance of the treaty signed in Washington is determined.

OGONEK's Korotich on Washington Summit

PM151132 Rome LA REPUBBLICA in Italian 10 Dec 87 p 2

["E.F." interview with OGONEK Editor Vitaliy Korotich in Washington; date not given]

[Text] Washington—[E.F.] Vitaliy Korotich, you are editor of OGONEK, one of the newspapers most representative of glasnost: What impression did it make on you to see Gorbachev singing in Russian with a Texan pianist at the gala dinner at the White House?

[Korotich] An unpleasant impression because it was a scene that I had to watch on television: There were only 14 Russians there out of a total of 100 attending and I was not among the lucky few. Joking aside, I am pleased: The more normal contacts there are between our two people, the better. If we sing together perhaps it will become more difficult for us to fire missiles at one another, will it not?

[E.F.] What impression does this atmosphere of sudden harmony between two old adversaries make on a Soviet journalist invited to the summit?

[Korotich] We are approaching Christmas, a period of great expectations and goodwill throughout the world. Perhaps through some strange miracle Father Christmas will give us another major arms reduction accord to put under the tree, the same Christmas tree that Reagan lit up in front of the White House a few hours after Gorbachev's arrival in Washington. You see, for a long time in Russia and America we have been the victims of a mechanism that builds mutual hatred, rancor, and suspicion. Now people in Washington, Moscow, Rome, and Paris are becoming aware of the need to build a mechanism for spreading trust, peace, and respect.

[E.F.] You talk about Christmas—a Christian religious festival. When he greeted Shultz at the airport Gorbachev said "May God help us." Now it is being said that in Reykjavik the Kremlin leader revealed to Reagan that he believes in God, albeit in his own way. Is this just gossip, or something more?

[Korotich] I cannot seriously believe that he is a believer, but there are traditional values that make you religious even if you are not so culturally or ideologically. In our country too Christmas and Easter have a very strong religious significance; we sing Christmas carols in Russia too.

[E.F.] What do Soviets visiting Washington have to say about this story concerning tensions between Nancy and Raisa?

[Korotich] It seems to me largely a fabrication of the mass media, but I find nothing wrong in it. It is normal, after all, just as Gorbachev is the first Kremlin leader to show that he maintains normal relations with his wife. What if people do notice what Raisa wears? It is normal; it happens with Nancy Reagan and it happens in any country of the world.

[E.F.] So in your opinion does normality mean following Western criteria?

[Korotich] No, but it is abnormal for a head of state to appear like a kind of sexless god, above normal interpersonal relations. Of course we must ponder the meaning of normality: Everyone told me how well I did and how brave I was to publish Pasternak in my newspaper, but perhaps what I did was simply normal. It was more abnormal and more stupidly courageous to ban him for such a long time.

[E.F.] Gorbachev explained the gospel of restructuring to Paul Newman, Norman Mailer, and Yoko Ono and asked for their help. Does he do the same with Russian artists? Has the time come to say: "Intellectuals of the world unite"?

[Korotich] Hitherto it has been the "hawks," the bureaucrats, who have united. Russia's conservatives are the best friends of America's; they are similar to them because idiots are the same worldwide, whereas a smart Italian is different from a smart Russian, who is different from a smart American. Traditionally an intellectual likes an ivory tower from which to assert his superiority. Gorbachev is right, however: The creative forces must unite because the forces of reaction—our enemy—are very strong.

[E.F.] Nixon says in NEWSWEEK that Gorbachev does not envy America at all. Do you find anything to envy in this country?

[Korotich] I envy the desire for happiness today, in the present. In Europe we tend to concern ourselves with our grandchildren's happiness. On the other hand you risk becoming very cruel in order to achieve your own happiness very quickly.

[E.F.] How much does Gorbachev know about America?

[Korotich] He knows what his advisers know because, in this age of terrorism, he is forced to observe it through the windows of a bulletproof car This is a pity because he is a cultured and inquiring man. I myself have been able to discuss art and literature with him. He may not be perfectly acquainted with Waldo Emerson, whom he quoted in his White House speech, but he is well-informed and is interested in American fiction and cinema.

[E.F.] Will he succeed in imposing his reforms and gaining a victory for restructuring?

[Korotich] It would be terrible if he did not succeed. There is no alternative to restructuring; it is our only path to democracy. We need democracy in the USSR and will have to fight a tremendous battle to achieve it. I hope we succeed, however.

Gerasimov: 'Achievements Must Be Consolidated'

PM151427 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 15 Dec 87 p 1

[Observer Gennadiy Gerasimov article under the rubric "The World on Tuesday": "Amazement and Interpretation"]

[Text] New York, December—Americans did not cease to be amazed last week.

There were good reasons why.

In actual fact, who would have imagined 3 years ago that...

...The Soviet leader would exchange handshakes and chat with passersby on Connecticut Avenue;

...The U.S. President would say that world domination forms no part of Soviet intentions;

...A Soviet marshal would visit the Pentagon and its top secret "situation room," while U.S. newspapers would publish maps showing the location sites of Soviet missiles. As THE NEW YORK TIMES wrote 13 December, "a whole generation of spies risked their lives for this kind of information."

Americans' initial impressions from the summit meeting in Washington are personal. Newspaper and television correspondents eagerly sought out people who had conversed with M.S. Gorbachev or had simply had an opportunity to come into direct contact with him. The response was most enthusiastic. Here are a few examples.

Paul Newman, actor: "He is free and easy by nature."

Joyce Carol Oates, writer: "He says such nice things, it seems that he has come from another planet."

Pamela Harriman, widow of the wartime U.S. ambassador to Moscow: "I am convinced that he is committed to the same ideology as the others, but he has such dynamism that, I must say, he has simply taken this city by storm."

The Soviet leader is trusted. Opinion polls show that he enjoys unprecedented prestige among Americans. Grumbling conservatives found themselves in an obvious minority. They grumble, their grumbles are given television time and newspaper space, but they are obviously fighting a rearguard action. Even though they ought not to be ignored, it is not they who determine the atmosphere now.

The atmosphere is determined by revived hope and common sense.

Of course, the atmosphere may be changeable but, in contrast with the elements of nature, the political atmosphere also depends on human actions. This is why great importance is attached to the next stage, on which Americans are now embarking following the initial stage of amazement—the stage of interpretation.

By no means are all Americans versed in the finer points of missile balances and military-diplomatic compromises. But the overwhelming majority sense a change in relations. They find it difficult to understand missile operations ranges or obscure sublevels of nuclear systems. But they are in favor of mutual understanding and against confrontation. The process of establishing mutual understanding and the conversation which was—to use President Reagan's expression—with each other rather than about each other, were actually taking place before their very eyes last week. The conservatives are trying to hinder the process of interpretation. For example, during Sunday's ABC-TV program "This Week With David Brinkley," conservative observer George Will tried to revive the thesis about Soviet desire for world domination which (the thesis) had been just rejected by the President himself. But he failed to adduce any proof, unless quotations out of context with the time can be considered proof. The nuclear age demands new political thinking and, it seems, Americans are beginning to realize this.

Our political-diplomatic pressure caught America unawares. David Ignatius and Michael Getler wrote in THE WASHINGTON POST 13 December: "Events have moved at such speed in the last few months that U.S. officials have hardly had time to assess Gorbachev's new policy, let alone prepare a sensible response fo their own.... Gorbachev and his diplomats are all over the world map while America looks on and waits for his next step."

But the authors of the article in THE WASHINGTON POST are probably excessively self-critical. Ultimately, the accords reached in Washington are the product of efforts by both sides even though, of course, there were quite a few heated arguments, right up to the actual moment the meeting was scheduled to end. But they have correctly identified the source of the initiatives.

Now we have the important period when achievements must be consolidated and developed. People here are not speaking of a "second detente," people here are not writing about the "spirit of Washington." Of course, people in politics are at times justified is presenting the desirable as the reality, since such a presentation could step up efforts and actually transform the desirable into the reality. But the experience of the past teaches us not to labor under any delusions but to double and treble efforts, develop the achievements, and continue the improvement of Soviet-U.S. relations. The continuation of the process of nuclear disarmament will prove possible if the period of interpretation of events leads Americans to the conclusion that our two great powers must act together on the most important matter—self-preservation.

Burlatskiy on Summit, Future Prospects

PM151502 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 16 Dec 87 pp 9, 14

[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA Political Observer Fedor Burlatskiy article: "From Washington to Moscow"]

[Text] Readers of our newspaper already know from television and radio broadcasts and press publications about the results of the historic meeting between the leaders of the two great powers at the highest level.

All those of us who were fortunate enough to have the opportunity to attend M.S. Gorbachev's news conference in Washington were tremendously impressed by the assessments made of the meeting. The conclusion of the Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles, as well as the Joint Soviet-U.S. Statement, constitute a major event in world politics and the reaching of a new stage in bilateral relations between the USSR and the United States. The whole world witnessed the first real step along the path to nuclear disarmament in the entire postwar period. Important prerequisites were created for a 50% reduction in strategic arms and the signing of an agreement to that effect during the next meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan in the first half of next year.

The results of the Washington meeting can only be understood in the context of the entire process of Soviet-U.S. relations in recent years. The Geneva meeting, where the two leaders of the modern world's biggest powers got to know each other for the first time, marked, if I can put it this way, the first psychological stage in a turnabout in Soviet-U.S. relations. Here the remarkable statement was adopted, the significance of which was once again emphasized by M.S. Gorbachev. In Reykjavik, in spite of what many shortsighted experts and journalists wrote after the end of the meeting, there was a genuine political breakthrough toward businesslike discussion of disarmament problems. Washington marked the completion of a stage lasting nearly 3 years, a stage packed with dynamic dialogue, debates, and the quest for solutions aimed at strengthening strategic stability and lessening the danger of the outbreak of conflict. It may be hoped that there will now be no return to unconstructive discussions of the contradictions between the two political systems, which are well known to everyone. It has become obvious that the only basis there can or should be for Soviet-U.S. cooperation is genuine national interests, consideration for the other side's positions, and a high sense of responsibility on the part of the great powers toward all mankind.

The long stage from Geneva to Washington could be called a transition to businesslike cooperation and the rectification of past mistakes. It should be acknowledged that mistakes were made on both sides, although clearly their significance and weight differ. The main mistake was that the leaders of the two states for decades regarded the other side as some kind of pirate just waiting for the right moment to inflict an annihilating nuclear strike. Of course, we have a right to say, as we have said more than once, that we were "playing black," responding to the other side's moves. It is not hard to demonstrate this, because the Americans were the first to create nuclear weapons and initiated the creation of no fewer than 20 systems of instruments of mass destruction. But that is not much consolation to us, because we were forced to take up the challenge and also join in the arms race. The recognition of the absolute impermissibility of a nuclear war between the USSR and the United States, in which there can be no winner, has now developed into a permanent duty of the two great powers to the whole world community—to prevent any war between them and promote the total exclusion of armed conflicts from present-day international relations.

It was not for nothing that M.S. Gorbachev spoke of the principle of "sufficiency" of arms necessary for defense. Many Americans acknowledge this. In a conversation with me, former U.S. Defense Secretary R. McNamara said that it is sufficient to have a few hundred warheads for mutual deterrence. This approach could pave the way to what the peoples of the world dream of—the total elimination of all nuclear weapons.

Another position which has for decades poisoned the atmosphere in Soviet-U.S. relations is also being reconsidered. This is the tendency to attribute to the other side the desire totally to destroy the rival's sociopolitical system. Many Americans to this day repeat seriously N.S. Khrushchev's remark during his visit to America to the effect that the only dispute we have with the United States is on the "land question"—the question of "who will bury whom." Of course, that was no more than an unfortunate joke, because it was N.S. Khrushchev, at the 20th CPSU Congress, who emphasized the principle of peaceful coexistence between the USSR and the United States, between East and West. It is no accident that this principle was backed up by the idea of the peaceful transition of other countries to socialism. That idea totally rejected any "urging on of world revolution."

Just before his trip to the United States, M.S. Gorbachev, in his book "Restructuring and the New Thinking for Our Country and the World," put forward a principle whose significance cannot be overstated—the deideologization of interstate relations. I particularly remember the moment when a U.S. correspondent asked M.S. Gorbachev, during the news conference, whether his recent meeting had promoted understanding by the two leaders of the aims, tasks, and nature of the other side's social system. The room fell silent, awaiting the answer. When M.S. Gorbachev said that the two leaders' opinions had changed for the better, a roar of approval and satisfaction swept through the room.

This means that a process is taking place of correcting wrong ideas about each other, about our two so dissimilar civilizations, which, however, can and must coexist on one planet. It means that the time has come to rid ourselves of all messianic aspirations, all inclinations to impose one's own system, one's own model for life, on other peoples and states. It would, of course, be a mistake, it would be jumping the gun, to think that the U.S. leadership is fully in agreement with this idea. It will probably take years and years for the idea of deideologization to triumph in our relations with the West.

I was also struck by another idea put forward during the news conference: the frank acknowledgment that politicians lag behind the people's feelings, that even children understand better and more clearly the need to take a new look at each other and make friends rather than entering into conflict. Indeed, this objective factor shows that the public in each country, and indeed the world public, is becoming increasingly actively involved in the decision making process, and that progressive politics draws from this source inspiration for more and more new initiatives.

On the eve of the meeting the U.S. press published data from public opinion polls which showed the Soviet leader's tremendous popularity among Americans. But the results of the visit itself surpassed all expectations. No U.S. television company—and they are numbered not in tens, but in hundreds—failed to report and comment on—as a rule, in a spirit of goodwill—the entire course of the talks and the speeches of the two leaders and other members of the delegations. The overall spirit of the assessments was uniform. The American people's common sense prevailed over attempts by individual conservative and reactionary commentators to belittle the significance of what was achieved. The aphorism formulated by M.S. Gorbachev during the news conference was confirmed in practice: Constructive policy is the best propaganda.

It must also be noted that a considerable role was also played in this breakthrough to the U.S. public by tens and hundreds of statements by representatives of Soviet science, culture, and journalism who took part in the historic event. We were given unprecedentedly wide opportunities to express our opinions on all the problems that interest the American public, from the most urgent questions of disarmament to the problems of glasnost and restructuring, which were invariably at the center of attention in all the Americans. They regard the reforms taking place in the USSR as "a very important" and some say "the most important" element in the changing psychological climate between the USSR and the United States. In other words, our restructuring is not only an integral part, it is the catalyst of the restructuring of the entire system of international relations. That is a success, and one that is perhaps no less significant than the first treaty on the elimination of an entire class of missiles and nuclear warheads.

It must be acknowledged frankly that it was not very easy for Ronald Reagan to sign the present treaty. It will be even harder for him during the period of preparations for his visit to Moscow. The convoluted maneuverings of public forces and movements taking place around these crucial events are enough to make the devil break his leg, as we say in our country. During my 10 days in the United States I heard so many different assessments and predictions that it would take not weeks, but months to reduce it all to a common denominator. Professor D. Sanders [as published], a well-known television commentator on Soviet-U.S. relations, told me that the distribution of political forces in the United States is now all topsy-turvy.

Readers already know of the bizarre incidents that accompanied the meeting: One modern Mccarthyist dared publicly to call the President an "idiot." But it should not be concluded from this that people on the right have become stronger in the United States. They simply began to shout louder than before when they became convinced of their defeat. Their hopes of averting or at least postponing the treaty were dashed. That put them into a frenzy.

Frankly speaking, we have long failed to take into account one characteristic of the U.S. system. We still do not really understand the nature of the pluralism of political institutions in the United States. The final adoption of decisions in the United States is influenced by various forces—within the administration, in Congress, among the industrial complexes' lobbyists, in the press. It is also necessary to take into account the constant public opinion polls showing a rise or fall in the popularity of this or that leader. The President's efforts to achieve an agreement on medium-range missiles, as well as on other disarmament questions, are now supported by democrats and liberals, while his blood brothers in the Republican Party not infrequently indignantly dissociate themselves from him. Senator Edward Kennedy said in a conversation with me that the Democrats are energetically supporting the treaty, and he is convinced that the treaty will be ratified in Congress.

The extent to which "everything was in turmoil in the Oblonskiy household" [quotation from Tolstoy] is indicated by the following. During my joint appearance on CBS television with H. Kissinger, who is known to this day in America as the "author of detente," he admitted, verbally, the importance of the treaty that has been achieved, but began to link future steps in the disarmament sphere to the need for a change in the USSR's policy on regional problems, above all Afghanistan, and also to internal developments in our country. It was Kissinger saying this, the man who in the seventies came out energetically against the linkage of Soviet-U.S. relations and demands for changes within each of the systems.

Here is another curious indication of the current changes within the U.S. political elite. One of the most likely presidential candidates from the Democratic Party, a man of progressive views, A. Gore, while coming out energetically in favor of a 50% reduction in strategic arms, at the same time, strange as it may seem, criticizes the position of R. Reagan and G. Shultz from the right. Gore argues that the administration underestimates the question of mobile missiles. Gore claims that the majority in Congress supports the idea of creating Minuteman missiles in the United States, and if Reagan fails to reckon with that, there will be great difficulties over the ratification of a strategic arms reduction agreement.

There are not so very many outright opponents of the newly signed treaty in the Senate—no more than 15, while it would take 34 votes to wreck the treaty. True, the treaty's opponents are counting on delaying ratification so as to make it impossible for the President to go to Moscow before the summer of 1988, because the most active part of the presidential election campaign will begin in the second half of the year. Nonetheless authoritative experts believe that ratification will become a fact by March-May.

This does not mean that there will be no obstacles on the path from Washington to Moscow, in the period when the treaty's ratification will take place and preparations will be made for the two leaders' meeting in Moscow. Senator D. Moynihan began his conversation with me on Capitol Hill by assessing the treaty highly. But he noted that a really serious analysis of the difficulties and problems in relations between our countries is now in progress. Moynihan said that in talks with the Soviet leaders he tried to explain why America attaches such great importance to freedom to emigrate from the USSR. The point is, in his opinion, that America is a country of emigres. It has absorbed various national and ethnic groups from all over the world. Moynihan himself, who represents New York State in the Senate, speaks of the tremendous pressure exerted on him, in particular, by Russian emigres. He includes in this Russians, Balts, Ukrainians, Jews, and others having their origins in the USSR.

It was in Moscow that I met with Senator B. Bradley, a representative of the moderately conservative section of the Democratic Party. He is chairman of a finance subcommittee in Congress, and therefore our talk dealt mainly with the development of Soviet-U.S. cooperation in the sphere of the economy and humanitarian relations. Bradley stressed that in his opinion the main factor in both economic and other forms of cooperation between our two countries is the internal reforms in the USSR—glasnost, restructuring, the creation of an open information society. It is this that is creating an increasingly favorable climate in the United States for the development of cooperation in all salients. Of course, the development of relations between U.S. business circles and Soviet industry depends on this. There are already many businessmen in the United States who want to invest money in the Soviet economy. But a number of problems worry them: the strict administrative control in the USSR, the unclear pricing policy, the insufficient mobility of manpower, the possibility of free access to the Soviet market, and so forth. "If I were a reformer in the USSR," Bradley said, "I would be particularly worried about the problem of the development of the economy in the West and the world market situation. Since the USSR proposes to play a new role in the world economy, the question of your participation in international economic organizations will inevitably arise. As a result, the mutual dependence of your economy and ours will increase."

In Washington I repeatedly had to give interviews in my capacity as chairman of the humanitarian cooperation and human rights commission of the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation. In this connection there were many meetings with leaders of U.S. public movements and groups advocating the development of this movement. I was particularly favorably impressed when Senator S. Hoyer, chairman of the human rights committee in Congress, came to the Vista Hotel, where a group of Soviet experts and journalists was staying, just before our departure, to make contact with me. He proposed to begin businesslike cooperation with us so as to make it possible to move on from mutual accusations to constructive dialogue, the comparative analysis of real problems in strengthening socioeconomic and civil rights in our two countries, and mutual enrichment with experience. This topic held an important place in other contacts with Americans, too.

A couple more words, in conclusion. Together with Academician V.N. Kudryavtsev and writers S.P. Zalygin and G.Ya. Baklanov, I attended a service on 6 December in Washington's large cathedral. It was devoted to the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting. Taking part in the service were representatives of the most diverse Christian associations of the United States and the USSR. It was an impressive and unforgettable event. There were most likely no believers among our small group. But we all felt the same feelings, feelings which brought tears to our eyes. The church joined its voice to the millions, nay, billions of voices all over the world, voices of those who long to deliver themselves, their children and grandchildren, and all future generations from the humiliating fear of universal destruction. If prayers could help this cause, I am convinced that not only Christians, Muslims, and Buddhists, but atheists too would join in...

So a vast distance was undoubtedly covered from Geneva to Washington. As John Kennedy said during the Caribbean crisis, "the first step is the most important." That step has been taken, and taken boldly, mutually. The overloaded arms dreadnought has begun to turn around for the return journey. Nobody can ever erase that achievement.

But the distance that remains to be traveled from Washington to Moscow is far greater than that already covered. There is still an extremely large number of obstacles, difficulties, and problems in the struggle for strategic disarmament and the implementation of a radical change in Soviet-U.S. relations. The conclusion is obvious: The forces interested in further progress on both sides of the ocean cannot, have no right to, relax even for a moment, still less to rest on their laurels. Only if they work indefatigably together to pull the tug-of-war rope in the direction of peace, will the Moscow stage of the historic path to the total elimination of the nuclear threat and to good and, later, friendly relations between the USSR and the United States, become a reality.

PRAVDA Cites Foreign Leaders on Summit

PM151551 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Dec 87 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Widespread Approval"]

[Excerpts] 14 Dec—The signing of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles and the deepening of the dialogue between the Soviet and U.S. leaders on other problems impart new momentum to the normalization of relations between the two great powers and to the improvement of the general international atmosphere, it is noted in foreign reactions to the outcome of CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev's official visit to Washington. Washington [subhead]

The treaty will have the backing of the vast majority of Republicans, said U.S. Vice President George Bush, who is seeking the Republican Party's nomination as candidate for the upcoming presidential election in the United States. The point is, he said on NBC-TV's "Meet The Press" Sunday, that it is a good treaty and it enjoys wide support.

The U.S. vice president expressed confidence that before the Reagan administration's term expires a new Soviet-U.S. treaty will be signed on halving strategic nuclear armaments. At the same time, he stressed that President Reagan is fully determined nevertheless to continue implementing the "Star Wars" program. If I am elected President, Bush added, I will also continue to advocate active implementation of the SDI program.

According to a poll carried out by U.S. television companies, 82% of Americans reckon that the Soviet-U.S. summit has led to important positive changes in relations between the two countries. [passage omitted] Warsaw [subhead]

Polish Foreign Minister M. Orzechowski, in an interview for the paper ZYCIE WARSZAWY, said: "The meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan was the most important event of 1987. Its results will determine the international situation to a considerable degree over the next few years. The Soviet-U.S. Treaty on Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles means stronger security in Europe and in the world as a whole. The document is also a psychological turning point. Its signing demonstrated that arms reduction and far-reaching arms control systems are possible given mutual concessions and the preservation of the principle of equal security. One salutes the far-sightedness and bravery of the leaders of the two great powers. The USSR's allies are highly delighted by the achievement of an important stage in the implementation of the program put forward by M.S. Gorbachev for delivering mankind from the nuclear threat. London [subhead]

The Soviet-U.S. treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles sets the seal on a "vast part of the specific actions that have been in the making over the past 8 years," British Foreign Secretary G. Howe stated. A great deal of specific work has been done in Washington which will make it possible to address other very important nuclear arms control issues. At the same time, he said, there are "exceedingly difficult" problems in the way of further progress in that area. [passage omitted]

Kobysh: INF Treaty 'Only Beginning'

PM151615 Moscow NEDELYA in Russian No 49 7-13 Dec 87 (Signed to Press 9 Dec 87) p 2

[IZVESTIYA Political Observer Vitaliy Kobysh "Editor's Column": "Done!"]

[Text] There were fears, I'll admit: Suppose something went wrong at the last moment. But everything went according to plan. The leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States signed the Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles at the scheduled time and in the agreed place.

Television was, of course, the first to report the event: It both reported and showed it. Virtually the whole world watched M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan signing the first agreement on the destruction of the first installment of nuclear weapons. But even television's omnipotence could not convey the feelings experienced on this occasion by people, different people in different countries.

"I am convinced that the treaty on the complete elimination of Soviet and U.S. medium- and shorter-range missiles will become an historic landmark in the annals of people's primordial striving for a world without wars," the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee declared after the signing of the treaty. It certainly will, because that which was accomplished was something stretching beyond the framework of a simple accord between the world's two leading powers on the elimination of two classes of nuclear missiles.

The world as such has changed substantially since 8 December 1987, the day when the treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles was signed. I would not wish to utter bombastic words to no purpose, but they are justified in this instance: Mankind has entered a new period of its existence, the epoch of the elimination of nuclear weapons.

This is, of course, only a beginning. During his visit to Washington M.S. Gorbachev will discuss with R. Reagan the question of a radical 50% reduction of strategic offensive arms while preserving the ABM Treaty, on which accord in principle was reached back in Reykjavik, of the destruction of chemical weapons, and of reduction of so-called "conventional" arms. But even if there is success in reaching accord on these problems and appropriate agreements are duly signed in, we hope, the immediate future, this will also be nothing more than a beginning. The nuclear threat, we repeat, has become only too real and is, if we might use the expression, breathing down everyone's neck. In order to survive, it is necessary to act immediately and all together.

In that same speech in Washington, the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee also uttered the following words: "I know that, in the context of the signing of the treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles, some politicians and journalists are already pondering: Who is the victor? I reject this formulation of the question. This is an anachronism of the old thinking. Common sense was the victor. Reason was the victor." This is indeed, in all likelihood, what makes 8 December of this year a special day. On that day it became clear: The overwhelming majority of people (and governments, I would like to hope!) came to realize that, even if we have not yet fully learned how to live in the new fashion, it is impossible to live in the old fashion, it would mean the end of everything, a universal self-destruction.

Yes, the nuclear threat is the most dangerous, the closest, and the most tangible of threats. But how many other threats are there—from ecological problems to the indebtedness of developing states which seems unreal in its size—that undermine peace, prosperity, and people's health. There is no point in taking comfort from the well-known platitude: Perhaps everything will turn out all right. Nothing turns out all right automatically. The atmosphere will not build up its own oxygen content, and the ozone layer which protects us from deadly ultraviolet rays will not repair itself. Given the existing order of things, millions of people will still die of starvation while hundreds of millions will be constantly undernourished.

Actions are demanded—joint, decisive, purposeful actions. We would not be talking about this if we believed that a call to do this would be nothing but a waste of breath. That which occurred on 8 December confirms that such actions are possible and that they are already a reality.

There is, however, no point in self-deception, in believing that from now on everything will run smoothly, along the paved highway. Some rather influential people in the United States, and not only just there, have become used to the existing state of affairs. Earning profits from it and existing like parasites on it, they are categorically against any changes at all, they are against the reduction and destruction of nuclear weapons.

Look what is being done in the United States. R. Reagan, who showed himself a fierce adversary of socialism from his very first days in the office of U.S. President, is being vilified in his own country by his allies of yesterday for the simple reason that now he has realized the pernicious nature of nuclear weapons for everyone, including the United States. He is being dubbed "appeaser," "defeatist," and almost "secret agent" of the Soviet Union. These "vigilantes" will do everything to prevent mankind from solving the problems it has encountered in the last years of the 20th century, problems which can with full justification be taken as falling within the Shakespearean formula: To be or not to be?

To be—there can be no question about it, this is what the overwhelming majority of people all over the world believe. They will fight until the end in order to be. The fight is already under way. A decisive historic victory was gained in this fight on 8 December.

Nitze Urges Senate Ratification of INF Accord

LD121436 Moscow TASS in English 1428 GMT 12 Dec 87

[Text] New York December 12 TASS—In the course of the Soviet-American summit meeting further progress has been made in drawing up an agreement on a cut in the strategic offensive arms, said Paul Nitze, special advisor on arms control matters to the U.S. President and secretary of state.

Addressing members of the Foreign Policy Association in New York, he said that the USSR and the USA had succeeded in resolving a number of considerable problems in that field, although much was yet to be done. We have discussed in detail the question of outer space defence and its linkage with strategic arms cuts, Nitze pointed out. We have not made considerable progress in that field. Everything we could do was to clarify the stands and draw closer on the nature of the divergencies between us. The presidential advisor stressed the importance of the speediest ratification by the Senate of the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles. He stressed that until that treaty was ratified there would be no chance for progress on the issue of strategic weapons and in the field of space weapons, where at present there is a good chance to conclude an agreement.

Larocque Comments on Signing of INF Treaty

PM141049 Moscow TRUD in Russian 11 Dec 87 p 3

[Interview with Admiral Gene Larocque, retired, director of the Center for Defense Information, by special correspondents A. Burmistenko and R. Kolchanov under the rubric "From the Military Viewpoint": "Reliable Verification"; in Washington, date not given]

[Text] Many political assessments are currently being made in the United States of the Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Nuclear Missiles, signed 8 December. But what do U.S. military experts think of the treaty? In order to find this out, TRUD special correspondents A. Burmistenko and R. Kolchanov visited the well-known research Center for Defense Information in Washington and talked with its director—Admiral Gene Larocque, retired.

To the traditional question about his general health and his mood Adm Larocque replied:

"I am in excellent health and mood, because I succeeded in meeting and talking with General Secretary Gorbachev at the Soviet Embassy. M. Gorbachev said that he is familiar with the research done by our Center for Defense Information, and he thanked us for our work and our suggestions for reducing the threat of war in the world."

[TRUD] What is your opinion of the treaty which has been signed?

[Larocque] From the military viewpoint it is of very great significance in many respects. It concerns the Pershing II and SS-20 missiles above all. The Pershing II's are very "fast" and accurate missiles which can hit targets in the western part of the Soviet Union after less than 10 minutes' flight time. This poses a great risk to the opposite side, particularly in crisis situations. The same can also be said of the SS-20 missiles targeted on West Europe. The elimination of this class of weapon will undoubtedly improve the entire situation on the European continent.

Further, all the points on verification and monitoring of the treaty's observance, which could also serve as a precedent in reaching an accord on a 50% reduction in strategic offensive arms, are extremely important. I will remind you that observance of the SALT I and SALT II Treaties signed in the seventies was monitored by national technical means, chiefly by reconnaissance satellites. The present treaty also includes very detailed on-site inspections.

There is also a whole number of other positive aspects to the new treaty. It demonstrates the readiness of the USSR and the United States to physically destroy comparatively new nuclear weapon systems which both sides could have had in their arsenals for a further 15-20 years. It asserts the principle of an asymmetrical arms reduction—which will be very important in the talks on reducing both strategic and conventional arms. The signing of this treaty also creates a very favorable political climate for future talks on disarmament and restores confidence in the entire arms control process.

[TRUD] Nevertheless, opponents of this treaty's ratification among the U.S. ultrarightists are continuing to go on about "inadequate guarantees of compliance..."

[Larocque] That is out of a desire to mislead the public. Judge for yourselves. Under the terms of the treaty the monitoring process will last 13 years. During the first 3 years each side will have the right to conduct up to 20 surprise inspections [proverki] each year on the other country's territory without the right of refusal. During the next 5 years it will be possible to hold up to 15 such inspections [proverki] a year, and during the last 5 years up to 10 inspections [proverki].

The U.S. inspectors will go to Moscow or Irkutsk, and the Soviet ones to Washington or San Francisco. Already on site, they will inform the other side's authorities just which areas and facilities giving rise to suspicion they would like to inspect. The receiving side is obliged to provide transport and take the group of inspectors—up to 10 people—to such a facility no later than 10 hours after being notified.

In addition, groups of inspectors from each country—each of 30-40 people—will be stationed permanently, 24 hours a day, near enterprises for the production of medium-range missile launchers throughout the 13 years. Soviet experts will inspect the Hercules Company's aerospace enterprise—the No 1 Plant in the city of Magna, Utah—while U.S. experts will inspect the Votkinsk Machine-Building Plant in Udmurtia. Groups of inspectors will weigh, measure, and subject to X-ray analysis all these enterprises' output so as to make sure that they are not producing missiles banned by the treaty.

If all this is "inadequate monitoring," as the treaty's opponents claim, I would like to know what further monitoring they demand.

[TRUD] Talks on a 50% reduction in strategic offensive arms are now coming to the fore...

[Larocque] From the military viewpoint such a treaty will be still more significant. It will embrace not only ground-based nuclear weapons but also strategic missiles on submarines and long-range bombers—missiles which the USSR and the United States can use to hit targets on each other's territory. On them are nuclear charges, of which, according to existing estimates, the United States has approximately 15,000, and the Soviet Union approximately 10,000. Thus, in terms of numbers, far more missiles and nuclear warheads will be destroyed than under the present treaty.

Strategic multiple re-entry vehicles, such as the Soviet Union's SS-18, SS-19, and SS-24 and the United States' MX and Trident 2's, are the most destabilizing nuclear weapons. It is primarily these missiles that will be subject to 50% elimination.

It must also be pointed out that each strategic missile costs many times more than a medium-range missile.

A 50% reduction in strategic weapons will be the next important step on the way to the complete removal of the nuclear threat.

PRAVDA Carries Gorbachev-Businessmen Talk

PM141537 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Dec 87 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Looking at One Another as Partners. M.S. Gorbachev Meets with Businessmen"]

[Text] Washington, 11 Dec—On Thursday M.S. Gorbachev met with a large group of eminent figures from the U.S. business world. Problems of Soviet-U.S. relations and the prospects for development of trade and economic exchanges between the two countries were discussed in a constructive and frank [otkrovennyy] spirit.

The following were present: S. Eker, W. Andrews, A. Hammer, B. Hilton, J. Giffen, D. Kendall, D. Kerns, R. Kennedy, L. Lauder, R. Mahoney, H. Maxwell, J. Murphy, D. Peterson, J. Petti, D. Rockefeller, F. Rokhatin, A. Spencer, T. Turner, R. Wood, A. Klauzen, J. Robinson, and other well-known businessmen, as well as U.S. Secretary of Commerce W. Verity.

E.A. Shevardnadze, A.N. Yakovlev, A.F. Dobrynin, V.M. Kamentsev, Yu.V. Dubinin, the leaders of a number of Soviet academic institutes, and economists were present at the conversation.

M.S. Gorbachev addressed the meeting, saying:

I deeply appreciate the opportunity to meet with representatives of business circles whose activities are connected with the very foundations of the lives of peoples and states.

In the 40 years since the war, we have been able to demonstrate that we can get along without each other. We have done this amazingly well. But in doing so, we have spent vast sums on the arms race and find ourselves sitting together atop an enormous powder keg, not knowing what will happen to us. This process must be discontinued. We must look at one another as partners, not as opponents. Now that substantial impetus has been given to political dialogue and the disarmament process, a favorable situation is being established for jointly considering: How are we going to trade now? How are we going to develop economic relations?

We could be useful to one another. We are sure that U.S. business could benefit from developing activities in the Soviet Union. We are sure that this collaboration would to some extent facilitate, and I would make no secret of this, the solution to our problems. We see ourselves as part of the world economy. You do not have to be an expert to appreciate the need for cooperation between our vast countries.

We are thinking about this, and we have done a great deal to this end in our legislation. We have taken political decisions on cooperation. This process is now gathering momentum. I would like you now to use the new forms and new approaches and participate in this joint exploratory work. Why? I do believe that logic and history have ordained that we are stuck with one another. Perhaps you would like to get rid of the Soviet Union so that it does not get in your way. Perhaps we have people who want to be rid of America so that it does not get in the way, but I believe it is unrealistic to think that way.

America and the Soviet Union are major realities of today. That being so, we must live and coexist. And best of all, if we are not just going to live and coexist, we should cooperate as well. Our people's perception of one another is changing, and this is very important too. People want to see processes of rapprochement, mutual understanding, and familiarization between our countries, and they want an atmosphere of trust to be generated. The Soviet leaders, the present leadership that put forward the course of restructuring and a new policy for its country, sees foreign economic links as a very important area of cooperation with other peoples, both from the viewpoint of domestic interests and from the viewpoint of strengthening international relations and providing them with a real foundation, a trade interest.

All people and peoples are interrelated, we have a common interest—banishing the threat of nuclear weapons, preserving peace, dealing with global problems and the consequences of the scientific and technical revolution and with ecological problems, backwardness, and poverty. We have to try to solve all this through common efforts. That is number one. Second, we believe that if we are more dependent on one another in the economic sphere, we will be more responsible in our policies toward one another. This is all highly dialectical and interconnected. The Soviet Government and those organizations linked to the economy, which are currently implementing the new mechanism and carrying out radical economic reform, essentially regard economic and trade cooperation between our countries as a factor of domestic development and of the strengthening of the international situation.

Of course, you have taught us lessons over the past decade, and we too have become cautious. It is not so easy now to draw us into this cooperation. I told the President that. When we were deprived of 17 million tonnes of grain at two days' notice—in the middle of winter, what is more, we had to seek ways of acquiring this grain. You know that happened when the embargo was imposed; it set us to thinking that we cannot look to the United States alone. Evidently, America can use economic links to get a stranglehold on us. That is one lesson. Now lesson two. We forged links with the West through barter agreements, through the purchase of equipment, through licenses, through component supplies, then the Cocom lists suddenly appeared and obstacles were erected. So when we were faced with the problem of how to solve our tasks—strategic, scientific and technical, technological—we said: No, no longer will we underestimate our own Soviet machine building, our own Soviet science. It has enormous potential. We have now doubled investments in our own machine building and increased them 5-7 times over in some areas of computer technology. We are developing all these advanced technologies and advanced areas in order to make up the lost ground. We already have a sense of the way our scientists, technicians, experts, and designers have become actively involved in the solution of the problem and how much talent we have in reserve.

We have learned from this, and we will not allow the country's interests to be hit again. But this does not mean at all that we are against large-scale projects and large-scale cooperation. No, we are still in favor of this. We will combine cooperation with solving tasks we have set ourselves. If someone is willing to join us and help us and get something out of it, we invite him to do so. We invite him, and we will seek approaches and create prerequisites for this cooperation. I am speaking to you in frank, simnple language, to make it clear that we are not dissembling. It must be clear that we are issuing an invitation to cooperation. Anyone inclined to join in will meet with support from the government, from the political leadership, and especially from economic and business circles.

It is necessary to consider how to develop trade when duty on our goods is approaching 75%. Is it possible to trade in that way? What kind of trade is it? Can the Soviet Union tolerate such a disrespectful approach? Our people are bewildered by this. Let us consider how to cast off these fetters. We realize that cooperation will not work if it is not advantageous as far as you are concerned. But let us also consider that we too should have an interest in bringing our goods to the U.S. market. In order to restructure political, economic, and cultural relations, in order to involve the broad masses of the people in exchanges, bring our peoples closer together and create the prerequisites for cooperation, it is necsssary to begin by clearing away the obstructions. For example, I very much welcome the idea of a consortium. It came from the U.S. side. Our people are very interested in it. They have already set up their own consortium. Therefore, when the leading centers of these consortiums have been determined, they will be able to establish contact, and a meeting is already planned for the very near future. It is a very interesting idea because we already have projects which one firm alone would not be able to deal with. There are very large projects, so joint efforts are needed. Think it over. We would welcome it. Joint enterprises are another new form. Incidentally, my talks with the President culminated in a final document, and it includes a fine provision on trade which enables business to use this joint statement as a basis. So you now have a political document which will serve you and help you go on to broader contacts and links.

I would like to end there. I invite you to participate in cooperation. I know that there are people here who can be described as realists. They may think long and hard, assessing whether it is worth linking up with us on a particular issue or a particular problem. But I also know that they are capable of accepting realities, appreciating them, and meeting the new approaches and new realities halfway.

During the ensuing exchange of views, it was stressed that the Washington summit talks were a turning point in relations between our two countries. They are of historic significance for the peoples of the USSR and the United States and the whole world.

The view was expressed that new opportunities have now emerged for the development of trade with the USSR. The U.S. businessmen expressed a high opinion of the policy of glasnost in the Soviet Union, which also extends to the foreign trade sphere. A number of speakers said that in recent years the most serious problem had been fluctuations in political relations between the USSR and the United States, which had had a serious effect on trade and economic exchanges. The CPSU Central Committee general secretary's visit to Washington, the representatives of business circles stressed, is an important step which will have a favorable influence on trade between the two countries.

Correction, Comparison to Reagan 4 Dec Interview

The following correction and comparison refers to the item entitled "Network Interview Cited" on page 20 of the 7 December Soviet Union DAILY REPORT. The correction pertains to the sourceline, which should read as follows: PM041933 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Dec 87 First Edition p 5 (changing word "Second" to "First") A comparison of the published first edition TASS report with the 5 December Moscow PRAVDA in Russian second edition carried on page 5 reveals the following variations: Page 20: Column two, paragraph two, sentence three reads: ...remain many thousands and thousands of units of... (adding "and thousands") Column two, paragraph three, sentence two reads: ...the whole world.

Reagan was asked... (deleting passage, picking up paragraph four, first sentence) Page 21: Column one, paragraph one, sentence two reads: ...observance of the treaty."

The opponents of... (deleting passage, picking up paragraph two, first sentence)

United States & Canada

IZVESTIYA Cites Reagan on Treaty, SDI
PM161019 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Dec 87 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under the "Facts, Events, and Opinions" rubric: "President Reagan on the Treaty on Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles"]

[Text] Washington, 15 Dec—The treaty signed between the USSR and the United States at the Soviet-U.S. summit on the elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles was a "historic achievement, an important step toward a more secure world," U.S. President Ronald Reagan has stated. He gave a speech at the capital's Center for Strategic and International Studies in which he talked on the whole about the prospects for arms control.

The President noted that the treaty "contains the promise of even greater progress in strengthening our security and putting relations between East and West onto a sounder footing." It was the "culmination of a long important process, the first step in building a more secure world," "the point of departure in relations between East and West, an effective and verifiable [podlezhayushchiy proverke] treaty which will lead to the first nuclear arms reduction in history."

The head of the U.S. Administration indicated that the treaty "enjoys unfailing support" from the United States' NATO allies. He acknowledged at the same time that in Western Europe and in the United States itself there are "many people who view this agreement with concern." The President expressed confidence that the hearings in the Senate on the ratification of the treaty "will remove any concern." Reagan meant above all the growing attacks on the treaty on the part of the extreme right wing of the Republican Party, whose representatives have now concentrated all their efforts on trying to compromise the treaty, find "flaws" in it, and thus obstruct its ratification in the Senate. The President noted in his speech that the regime for verifying [proverka] fulfillment of the terms of the treaty "will be the most rigid in the history of arms control talks" and this will have "far-reaching consequences."

He then called for a reinforcement of the NATO military bloc, citing the "imbalance" in conventional forces in Europe. At the same time Reagan made it clear that the North Atlantic alliance will continue to rely on nuclear weapons. "We will retain a modern potential for nuclear deterrence on the ground, in the air, and at sea," the head of the White House stressed.

He pointed out that "specific progress" was also achieved at the Soviet-U.S. summit toward securing agreements between the USSR and the United States on a 50% reduction in strategic offensive arsenals. At the same time the President once again stressed his administration's intention to continue work on creating a large-scale ABM system with space-based elements. The United States, he said, "will move ahead with the SDI program." "When this system of strategic defense is ready, we will deploy it," Reagan stated.

Meets With Republican Leaders
LD152013 Moscow TASS in English 1708 GMT 15 Dec 87

[Text] Washington December 15 TASS—President Reagan held in the White House today a meeting with leaders of the Republican Party in the U.S. Congress. One of the main items on its agenda was the discussion of the prospects for prompt consideration and ratification of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles signed at the recent Soviet-American summit.

Immediately after the conversation with the leaders of the Republican group in the Congress, a meeting of a special working group of Republican senators was held in the White House with President Reagan's participation. The group will study in detail the treaty on intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles.

First U.S.-Soviet Joint Enterprise Profiled
PM081127 Moscow EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA in Russian No 49, Nov 87 (Signed to Press 26 Nov 87) p 20

[B. Rachkov article: "USSR-United States: Mutually Advantageous Business"]

[Text] An agreement on the creation of the first Soviet-U.S. joint enterprise—"PRIS" ("Applied Engineering Systems")—on Soviet territory has been signed in Moscow. Its co-owners will be the USSR Ministry of the Petroleum Refining and Petrochemical Industry's "Neftekhimavtomatika" Scientific Production Association and the U.S. Combustion Engineering company. Specializing in the production of various technical systems, this company is one of the larger U.S. industrial corporations: Some 27,000 people work at its enterprises and its gross income is around $2.6 billion a year.

The joint enterprise will develop and produce automated management systems for catalytic cracking and hydrocracking installations, complexes for the production of aromatic hydrocarbons, and installations for the production of ethylene, propylene, and other chemical products.

The constituent capital of "PRIS" has currently been set at R20 million. The Soviet side is making its 51% investment in the form of the metal-working equipment that "PRIS" needs for its activity and a number of applied programs, production premises, and other areas.

Combustion Engineering is providing the joint enterprise with general and applied software, certain types of equipment, and the technology for producing certain types of instruments, equipment, and management systems.

It is planned in the very near future to hold a meeting of the joint enterprise's board, which comprises three Soviet and two U.S. representatives. The direct management of the enterprise's economic activity will be carried out by directors headed by a general director, who is a Soviet citizen. The deputy general director for production will be a U.S. citizen.

Speaking at a news conference for Soviet and U.S. journalists, C. Hugel, chairman of the Combustion Engineering board, and N.V. Lemayev, USSR minister of the petroleum refining and petrochemical industry, reported that the 5-year production program for the "PRIS" firm agreed upon by the two sides would begin to be implemented in the second half of next year. The firm's co-owners intend initially to bring the volume of its production up to approximately R30 million a year. Given the great demand for the new firm's potential output, both sides see this volume as an initial minimum.

Combustion Engineering, its chief said, has already cooperated successfully for a number of years with Soviet partners in modernizing enterprises in the petrochemical industry. So the joint enterprise did not appear out of nothing. Nonetheless, before it could emerge it was necessary to resolve several financial, commercial, and administrative problems, including some linked with restrictions on shipments of U.S. technology to the Soviet Union. However, given mutual willingness and consistent efforts by the partners these difficulties can be overcome. Combustion Engineering, C. Hugel said, considers it an honor to be the first U.S. firm to start up a joint enterprise with partners from the USSR.

In his speech and replies Minister N.V. Lemayev talked about the virtually unlimited opportunities available to the USSR and the United States in cooperation in the petrochemicals field, which is so highly developed in both countries. He stressed the exceptional mutually advantageous nature of this first step down the road of developing joint enterprises which has been taken in setting up the "PRIS" firm. It will expand the U.S. partner's sphere of activity, while allowing the Soviet side to increase production of high-quality chemical products, including those in demand on world markets.

N.V. Lemayev informed journalists that the USSR Ministry of the Petroleum Refining and Petrochemical Industry is currently negotiating with a number of other U.S. companies with a view to setting up new joint enterprises, including organizations producing oils, additives, and certain types of petrochemical equipment.

The representatives of the "PRIS" co-owners expressed the unanimous opinion that the creation of this firm on the eve of the USSR-U.S. summit would be a small but significant act inspiring hope in the potential of multifaceted cooperation between the two powers in the interests of peace and progress.

Economists Conclude Roundtable Meeting

LD090921 Moscow TASS in English 0056 GMT 9 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 8 TASS—If humanity wants to survive it should restructure not only political but also economic thinking. This conclusion was made by the Soviet and the American participants in a round table meeting shown on central television of the USSR today. It summed up the results of a meeting of the Soviet and the American United Nations Associations on economic problems held in Moscow.

Taking part in the round-table meeting were deputy chairman of the foreign economic relations commission of the USSR Counci of Ministers Ivan Ivanov and president of the Marine Midland Bank John Petty, rector of the Soviet Academy of Foreign Trade Boris Vaganov and consultant at the U.S. Congress John Hardt, specialist in the area of economic planning Vladimir Kostakov and Professor of business Claudine Malone. They talked about how to restructure the international economic system on an equitable basis, about the ways of stimulating the development of bilateral commercial and industrial ties.

The Soviet and American specialists emphasized close relationship between prospects for economic cooperation and implementation of measures for disarmament. In this connection they welcomed the Soviet-American summit that has started and could result in the signing of the treaty on the elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles.

American guests said that perestroyka started in the Soviet Union has a beneficial effect on the development of business ties between the two countries. John Petty said that no less than 20 multinational corporations, in which U.S. firms participate, now conduct negotiations on the setting up of joint ventures on the USSR territory.

Soviet economists said that the development of mutually-advantageous business contacts is hampered by the United States discriminatory policy when many objects of trade are proclaimed to be "strategic" goods and when their export is vetoed. The guests had to admit that such restrictions are, as a rule, caused by political motives.

The road to the establishment of durable political and economic ties is not easy but it is necessary to continue the dialogue as it leads to a secure world, the participants in the round table conference noted.

TV Link Addresses Lokshin Family 'Persecution'

PM091055 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 5 Dec 87 p 8

[Article by TASS correspondents A. Mizinov and M. Svetlichnyy: "TV Linkup: The Lokshin Family and the Donahue Show"—first two paragraphs are readers' letter]

[Text] "Roughly 1 year ago, during a USRR-U.S. television linkup, we got to know the Lokshin family, which had been forced to leave its motherland and request asylum in our country. U.S. participants in the broadcast claimed that the Lokshins would very quickly discover what life was like in the Soviet Union and ask to return home.

"The Matveyev family, Leningrad".

On the night of 3-4 November Americans again had the opportunity to meet and converse with their compatriots, the Lokshins, who have now been living in the Soviet Union for more than a year. The direct television linkup was organized by Soviet television and Phil Donahue, with whom our TV viewers have become well acquainted of late.

The story of Doctor Arnold Lokshin and his family is also well-known to them... Lokshin, a biochemist studying the mechanism of anticarcinogenic drugs and ways of combating cancer-related diseases, well remembers 19 August 1986. That was the day that he discovered all the experimental animals in his Houston laboratory dead. Dozens, hundreds of sustained experiments and strenuous work over many months all reduced to naught through someone's malevolence. Shortly afterward he was dismissed without notice. This was the last link in the chain of a campaign of persecution against him, his wife, and even his children. The Lokshins applied for political asylum in the Soviet Union.

"Obsessive," "paranoiac," "turncoat" were the terms heaped upon Lokshin by the Western mass media. Phil Donahue organized a television linkup. The U.S. audience's reaction to the Lokshins was frankly hostile at the time and the linkup itself proved one-sided: The Lokshins could not even see their opponents and had to strain to hear the retorts of the opposite side. The program moderator promised the Lokshins that they would meet up on the air again a year later.

Here was Phil Donahue again on screen, via a satellite linkup, the Lokshins being in a television studio at Ostankino.

"How's life treating you there?" was the first, long-awaited question.

"I feel fine here and am working," Arnold answered. "It's been a marvelous year." "Yes, we are happy," said Lauren Lokshin. "We live a normal life and have everything we need. We have already almost completely adapted."

The children backed up their parents' opinion. It transpires that you can also study, have friends, play football, and watch TV in the Soviet Union.

This was obviously not at all the answer that the majority of the audience in the U.S. television studio, which was linked by telephone to the rest of America, expected . Mistrust, hostility, an air of challenge...were again, as they had been 1 year ago, felt in the questions and replies of those gathered on the other side.

Up until now many of them have not believed that the Lokshins were really persecuted. But then a live telephone call to the Donahue Show studio confirmed that this is quite possible in the United States. An agitated woman's voice from somewhere across the Atlantic said: "The same thing happened to us."

Yet the American audience apparently did not believe that life in the Soviet Union is entirely to the Lokshins' liking and that they are not persecuted. "If I have any problems with the KGB," Lokshin joked, "I promise that Phil Donahue will be the first to hear about it."

"The Lokshins are simply being used," an American lady in the Donahue studio stated peremptorily. "What makes you think that we are not telling the truth?" Lokshin asked his compatriot. "If you want to understand better what our life was like in the United States, imagine being regularly hit on the head with a hammer five times a day. And then it suddenly stops. What would your reaction be? The people around us in the Soviet Union display heartfelt warmth and genuine goodwill toward us."

Shortly before the broadcast a TASS correspondent visited the institute where the scientist works.

There are eight people, including two doctors and four candidates of science, working in the laboratory now headed by Arnold Lokshin.

"The laboratory's work," said Leonid Valsovich Moroz, director of an institute of the Cancer Research Center, "is involved with the search for effective means of treating malignant tumors. We have not created any special conditions for Lokshin; he works just like the other specialists. However, it can be said right now that the laboratory has obtained pretty good results: A number of the Academy of Sciences institutes use models obtained in Lokshin's laboratory, and articles are being prepared for publication in leading Soviet scientific journals."

"Arnold is a very agreeable and sociable person and a real professional" was the opinion voiced by his colleague, Doctor of Medical Sciences Yelena Revazova.

Candidate of Biological Sciences Vladimir Bergolts, who works in the laboratory, said that it was thanks to Lokshin's energy that the laboratory had managed to set up its work in such a relatively short time and, most importantly, that friendly relations prevail in the collective.

"The fruits of the campaign launched against our family in the United States," Arnold himself said with bitterness, "fall on soil that was well-fertilized by the long years of the cold war. Many Americans have been stuffed with anti-Soviet stereotypes for decades and they simply cannot understand how it is possible to live in such a 'dreadful' place as the USSR. Therefore the step which our family took plunged many people into shock."

Air time was running out, the TV linkup was coming to an end. Again the agreement with Philip Donahue regarding a new satellite linkup when the Lokshins' book "Silent Terror" is published was mentioned. "Why don't you publish the book in the States?" was the question Arnold himself put this time.

"People love to talk about the freedom of the press in America," Lauren Lokshin said. "But you won't find a single author openly speaking in favor of socialism in the leading U.S. publications. I could regularly write objective articles for the U.S. press about what is happening in the USSR." The moderator of the popular television television show promised to give support.

Yet it seemed to us that a small as yet barely visible shift had occurred in the attitude of the U.S. audience. There were people in the hall who were made to think by this new encounter with the political emigres from their own country, and the television screen showed clearly how serious and attentive their gaze was.

What does this indicate—our country's desire to energetically build bridges with the United States, a warming of the international climate, an agreement on medium-range and operational-tactical missiles in the offing, or, perhaps, the courage of an American family seeking to ensure that a ray of truth reach the U.S. audience through the barrier of lies? Most likely all these things together. "If even a few thousand Americans learn the truth about our family and our life here, we will consider that today's broadcast has been extremely useful," was how the Lokshins expressed their opinion of the program.

Southeast Asia

Further Reportage on ASEAN Summit Meeting

Gorbachev Message to Aquino

PM150919 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Dec 87 Second Edition p 1

[Gorbachev message to Aquino on ASEAN meeting]

[Text] To Her Excellency Mrs Corazon C. Aquino, chairman of the third ASEAN summit meeting and president of the Republic of the Philippines.

Esteemed Madame Chairman!

In connection with the third meeting of the state and government heads of the ASEAN countries, allow me to greet you and all its participants.

The present meeting of the ASEAN countries' leaders is taking place at a crucial time when hopeful signs have emerged of an improvement in the international situation, when mankind has been presented with real opportunities for embarking on the elimination of nuclear weapons and removal of the threat of nuclear catastrophe. The signing of the Soviet-American Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles is the first big step in the matter of real disarmament. It paves the way for important new accords on strengthening peace and security.

In the minds and hearts of millions of people in the world, anxiety is still strong in connection with the continuing arms race, the tension in many parts of the world, and the exacerbation of the developing countries' financial and economic difficulties, which are hampering their struggle to strengthen political and economic independence. In our view, further persistent efforts are needed to ensure that the positive advances in the current world situation develop into a stable trend leading to a nuclear-free, nonviolent, just world.

Madame Chairman!

The Soviet Union is following ASEAN's activity with interest and sympathy, and pays tribute to the positive results achieved by the member countries in the course of national construction and the organization of cooperation within the framework of the association. Having announced 20 years ago a course of economic, social, and cultural progress, the association's countries have overcome considerable difficulties and made marked progress in the implementing the set targets.

We value the ASEAN states' efforts to preserve peace, ease international tension, and bring about disarmament. We note the attention paid in the ASEAN countries to the Soviet Union's proposals on the problems of the Asian-Pacific region put forward in Vladivostok and in the MERDEKA interview. We appreciate the support for the Soviet initiatives in the United Nations and at other international forums where our countries are cooperating very fruitfully.

For our part, we recognize the considerable positive potential of such constructive proposals as the concept of transforming Southeast Asia into a zone of peace, freedom, and neutrality. The Soviet side has on more than one occasion expressed its positive attitude toward the desire of the ASEAN countries and other states in the region to create a nuclear-free zone in Southeast Asia. The practical implementation of these questions would be a substantial contribution to the normalization of the situation in that part of Asia.

Without doubt, the establishment of a lasting and stable peace in Southeast Asia would be aided in many respects by the disentangling politically of the conflict situation concerning Cambodia. We are deeply convinced that the situation in that region requires radical improvement and we are doing all we can to bring this about. We welcome any constructive efforts and initiatives leading to a solution of this problem of importance to the Asian-Pacific region. For its part, the Soviet Union is prepared to continue making its own contribution in promoting the implementation of practical steps to eliminate regional tension.

It is our firm belief that the organization of extensive equal and mutually advantageous cooperation among all Asian states is a reliable guarantee of the elimination of the threat of war and the improvement of the political climate in Asia and the Pacific Ocean basin. It is the correct way to establish trust and mutual understanding among the peoples.

I want to reemphasize that the Soviet Union is open to various, including collective, forms of mutual relations with the ASEAN countries and is willing to maintain relations with the association as such.

Respectfully yours,

M. Gorbachev.

Moscow TV on Conference

OW160815 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2320 GMT 14 Dec 87

[Ye. Lukyanov commentary; from the Novosti newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] A conference of heads of ASEAN states and governments opened in Manila. On the occasion of this summit, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev sent a message of greetings to Corazon Aquino, chairman of the ASEAN summit and president of the Philippines. Our commentary:

[Lukyanov] Created in 1969 to facilitate the economic, social , and cultural development of Southeast Asian countries, this regional organization unites 6 countries — Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, Thailand, Philippines, and Brunei. The present summit meeting, the third in the two decades of ASEAN existence,is dedicated to the questions of economic cooperation and the strengthening of security in the region. Already the speakers at the Manila conference gave a positive appraisal of the recently signed Soviet-U.S. Treaty for the Elimination of Medium and Shorter-Range Missiles. In the words of Indonesian President Suharto, this will have a stabilizing affect on the situation in Southeast Asia, on the solution of conflict situations, and regional problems.

It is therefore quite natural that questions on the support of peace and stability in this vast region of the world should loom large at the ASEAN summit meeting. In particular, this include the initiatives to create a zone of peace, freedom, and neutrality in Southeast Asia, as well as the proposal to proclaim the region a nuclear free zone. As for the latter, this involves talks on a draft agreement which may be signed some time in the future, an important step in itself towards a nuclear free world.

The participants of the Manila conference have focused their attention on the economic problems of the region, as well as questions of cooperation, which they hope to inspire with new dynamism and fresh ideas. At the same time the 6 counties are working from the premise that under the conditions of economic depression and a fall in the value of the dollar, they should, in the first place, rely on their own efforts so as to solve, at least in part, the problems of economic development accrued in recent years.

The ASEAN countries are placing much store on the present meeting in Manila, which they hope will lead to new successes in business of national development, regional cooperation, and the preservation of peace and stability.

Cambodian Issue Key Focus

BK160215 Moscow in Cambodian to Cambodia 1330 GMT 15 Dec 87

[Unattributed commentary: "Genuine Path Toward Solving the Situation"]

[Text] The third ASEAN summit set aside quite a lot of time to examine the Cambodian problem. Our observer notes:

Some basic steps have been made toward solving this problem, which is why the Manila summit has accepted the recent meeting in Paris between Comrade Hun Sen, chairman of the PRK Council of Ministers, and Samdech Norodom Sihanouk.

The attitude of the ASEAN leaders reflects their concern over the political resolution; indeed, some of these leaders have made concrete contributions to this process, such as Indonesia's proposal agreed upon with Vietnam in Ho Chi Minh City last July. Measures taken in accordance with this agreement have served as the objects of the first Vietnam-Indonesia meeting held in Bali in November.

As officially announced, Indonesia and Vietnam have made some progress regarding this matter. (? They might also welcome) Thailand's decision to withdraw a number of its troops from the Cambodian border. This is a measure leading toward reducing tension.

Bangkok made this decision after the sixth withdrawal of the Vietnamese Army Volunteers from Cambodia. As noted by the Bangkok newspaper THE NATION, Thai authorities made this decision because there is no military threat by Vietnam. The newspaper added that Hanoi is very firm in its words about withdrawing its troops from Cambodia.

According to observers, this concrete change is attributable to the PRK's national reconciliation policy. This policy appeals to all compatriots, regardless of their past and differing ideologies, to unite, and calls for a dialogue between Phnom Penh and the opposition groups.

As noted in Comrade Hun Sen's message to the Cambodian people on 12 December, Cambodia accepts any talks, bilateral or unilateral, so long as the objective is a solution to the Cambodian problem.

The national reconciliation program projects the withdrawal of Vietnamese Army Volunteers from Cambodia when outside interference in Cambodia's internal affairs ceases. But, as the comrade chairman of the PRK Council mf Ministers has stated, the United States continues to give aid to those groups opposing the national reconciliation policy. It has been noted that some of these forces have not yet grasped this constructive policy. They are the elements who have tried to maintain the Cambodian problem and to prevent a political resolution in accordance with the Cambodian people's wishes. As proof of this, they have resorted to tricks regarding the agreement reached in France between Comrade Hun Sen and Samdech Norodom Sihanouk. Such tricks have also been played during the Manila meeting. At the Manila meeting, some elements have demanded a total and immediate withdrawal of the Vietnamese Army Volunteers from Cambodia.

The national reconciliation program will face uncountable problems because the enemies to this program have refused to abandon their insane desire. However, there are also optimists who support this national reconciliation policy after hearing its first few points.

The Soviet people hold that the political solution to the Cambodian problem will help restore firm and lasting peace in Southeast Asia. In his message to the third ASEAN summit, Comrade Mikhail Gorbachev highly valued the efforts and the constructive proposal for the settlement of the Cambodian problem. The message added that even in the future, the Soviet Union will always be ready to contribute to anything which will lead toward eliminating regional tension.

Cambodian Reconciliation Process Described

PM151445 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Dec 87 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent B. Vinogradov "Report From the Scene of Events" "Unraveling the 'Cambodian Knot'"]

[Text] Phnom Penh—As already reported in IZVESTIYA, last week saw the start of the latest—sixth—stage of the withdrawal from Cambodia of the Vietnamese volunteer forces that fulfilled with honor their international duty to the fraternal Cambodian people. Thousands of people attended a rally Sunday in Phnom Penh to mark this important event, providing a vivid demonstration of Cambodian-Vietnamese friendship. Following the completion of the current stage, the number of Vietnamese volunteer servicemen in Cambodia will be half their original number.

As noted unanimously here by the foreign agency and press representatives gathered in the Cambodian capital, the present withdrawal of troops is the visible manifestation of the Cambodians' desire for national reconciliation. The troop withdrawal is also a confirmation of the sincerity of the Vietnamese leadership, which has pledged to end the military presence in Cambodia by 1990.

The time has also come for the other powers that have long been deeply involved in the Cambodian situation to prove their sincerity. This applies primarily to the United States and the PRC. Nobody has forgotten that it was precisely U.S. mass bombings that first destroyed the peace and stability of the country during the administration of Prince Norodom Sihanouk. Nobody here has forgotten that more than 600,000 Cambodians died in 1970-1975 as a result of the aggressive war unleashed by the United States against the Cambodian people, and that it was U.S. dollars that kept Lon Nol's regime in existence as it began to crank up the mincing machine of civil war.

As for the decision by China's leaders to give military, economic, and ideological support to the Pol Pot-Ieng Sary clique, that decision was taken during the so-called "Cultural Revolution" and was a kind of "export version" of that tragic period in the PRC's history. Now both the United States and the PRC could divest themselves of the responsibility for the actions of past years and make a positive contribution to unraveling the "Cambodian knot".

...The process of reconciling a nation that has undergone a time of troubles—wars, plots, and political intrigues—is not easy. It is sometimes associated with an agonizing process of overcoming anxious doubts and hestitations in the consciousness of each person who was involved in the tumultuous maelstrom of those events. A few days ago I managed to meet with some former commanders of Pol Pot formations who—in response to a call by the PRK Government—have broken with the antipopular clique and returned home.

In the security service building at Kampong Spoe I spoke to a no longer young man called Pho Phun. He was a company commander of one of the first division battalions of the "Khmer Rouge," under the influence of Pol Pot's grouping and his supporters. Smoking one cigarette after another, he described his own "Odyssey" of wanderings and service in the Pol Pot formations. He remembers well 17 April 1975, when the "Khmer Rouge" occupied Phnom Penh. His company was ordered to guard Pochentong airport. He also remembers how on that same day and the next crowds of evacuated inhabitants were driven from the city along the road to Kampong Spoe, and how the soldiers shot those who were insubordinate by the side of the road. Then he took part in the war which the Pol Pot-ists unleashed against Vietnam.

Pho Phun has spent the last few years in the Thmar Dar [name as published] camp on Thai territory, where the remnants of the Pol Pot Army settled.

"The camp stretched for approximately 10 km along the border with Kaoh Kong province," Pho Phun said. "There was iron discipline. Any insubordination was severely punished. As a rule, at nights armed raids were organized against Kampuchean People's Revolutionary Army border posts. The refugees were settled behind the line of the advanced borders, and they were forbidden to approach the military camps. Many tried to return to Cambodia, but they were caught by the soldiers, and punishment inevitably followed. Such was the law of camp life"

Pho Phun is one of those fighters of the Pol Pot formations who has nevertheless succeeded in breaking with his previous life and returning to Cambodia. How did this happen?

"I thought over a plan of escape for a long time," he said. "I did not share my thoughts with anybody. It was dangerous. An atmosphere of suspicion and persecution reigned in Stung Metak [name as published] camp where I spent my last days. Sabotage groups of 10-12 people were selected there, mainly from unfamiliar people. And then, when we next penetrated into Cambodian territory, I gave myself up to the local authorities. I believed that this was my only way to find my motherland again...."

Those who have returned and who sincerely wish to cooperate with the people's power not only have normal living conditions created for them, but are also frequently entrusted with responsible posts in the commissions for the reception of former members of reactionary formations. Our acquaintance Pho Phun is among their number. He has already done a great deal to help his former comrades-in-arms who have followed his example to return from the camps.

In Kampong Ihum Province, I made the acquaintance of Chin Chevun, former assistant commander of the Pol Pot 18th Division, based on Thai territory along the Cambodian border. He also recently went over to the PRK side and now works on the provincial committee. It must be said that in 1975-1979, he was in Phnom Penh on the Defense Ministry staff of the Pol Pot government, and obviously was directly involved in everything that was then going on in Cambodia. However, even such a past did not influence the decision of the people's power to grant him the rights of a citizen of the Republic. He returned and laid down his arms together with a detachment of his subordinates. Just as the government had promised, nobody was subjected to repression or victimization. They were all given the necessary material and medical help, and permitted to be reunited with their relatives and to start a new working life.

"I realized the pointlessness of our so-called struggle long ago," Chin Chevun told me. "The sense of guilt toward my own people for the errors of the past will stay with me all my life. I know that there are many who think like this, who still remain there, and who have not found the courage to take the decisive step."

"...Having declared a policy of national reconciliation," PRK Foreign Minsiter King Korm noted during a press conference last Friday in Phnom Penh, "the PRK Government calls on all Cambodians—regardless of their past and their ideological or religious views—to bread with Pol Pot and his immediate entourage and return home to take part in building an independent, free, and nonaligned Cambodia. We hope," the minister said, "that Norodom Sihanouk and Son Sann will accept our proposals and will make their own contribution to the reconciliation. The present withdrawal of two divisions of Vietnamese volunteers demonstrates the goodwill of the three states of Indochina toward the settlement of the Cambodian problem in all its aspects," King Korm stated.

Kong Korm also informed correspondents that Hun Sen, chairman of the PRK Council of Ministers, is going to Paris where on 2 December he will meet Norodom Sihanouk and hold talks with him on ways to settle the Cambodian problem. The PRK Government had suggested earlier that N. Sinhanouk return to Cambodia and take up a top state posts—so helping to accelerate the process of national reconciliation.

Near East & South Asia

Jordan's King Husayn To Visit Moscow 21 Dec

JN151747 Baghdad INA in Arabic 1737 GMT 15 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow, 15 Dec (INA)—Jordan's King Husayn will begin a 2-day official visit to the Soviet Union next Monday.

Arab diplomatic sources told the INA correspondent here today that during the visit King Husayn will hold talks with Soviet leaders on ways of promoting bilateral relations, the current situation in the region, the Iraq-Iran war, and international issues of mutual interest.

U.S.-Israeli Agreement Runs Counter to Peace

LD151357 Moscow TASS in English 1252 GMT 15 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 15 TASS—TASS Commentator Grigoriy Vasilyev writes:

U.S. Defence Secretary Frank Carlucci and Israeli Defence Minister Yitzhaq Rabin have signed an agreement under which Israel gets in the field of bilateral military cooperation the same rights as Washington allies in the NATO bloc.

The new ten-year agreement is meant to replace the U.S.-Israeli memorandum on mutual understanding in the field of strategic cooperation signed eight years ago. Israeli firms receive the right to take part in U.S. military contracts on a par with American firms, cooperation between the two countries in developing new types of weaponry receives a new boost. Judging by Western news agency reports, Washington guarantees, as minimum, keeping at the previous level the volume of military aid and arms purchases in Israel and compensates to Tel Aviv to a considerable degree the expenses incurred by the refusal to build a costly "Lavi" fighter-bomber. [sentence as received] The issue of the purchase by Israel of 100 latest F-16 combat aircraft in the United States is under discussion.

The details of the agreement signed in Washington have [word indistinct] been published. It is clear, however, that it signals a new step on the road to bolstering Israel's military machine and helps the Tel Aviv Zionist ruling hierarchy to carry on and extend the scope of aggression launched by it against Arab [word indistinct]. The principal goal of the militarist U.S.-Israeli alliance is to preserve Israel's military preponderance over Arab states, to boost further U.S. military-political presence in the Middle East and subordinate peoples and states in that region to the U.S.-Zionist diktat.

It is symptomatic that the new anti-Arab agreement was signed at the moment when the Israeli punitive troops mounted reprisal, which are unprecendented in their scope and severity, against the population of the West Bank of the Jordan River and the Gaza Strip protesting against the hated Israeli occupation regime.

By granting new large military privileges to Israel, Washington has forcefully demonstrated that its Middle East policy was and remains totally pro-Israeli, runs counter to Arab nations' vital interests as well as the cause of establishing a genuinely fair and lasting peace in that region.

Moscow RPP on New Agreement

TA152113 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Hebrew 1730 GMT 15 Dec 87

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] Defense Minister Yitzhaq Rabin and U.S. Secretary of Defense Secretary Frank Carlucci signed a new agreement in Washington for the expansion of strategic cooperation in the military sphere. Israel was raised to a status equivalent to that of the NATO countries in everything pertaining to arms purchases. Among other things, the administration promised to increase military procurement in Israel and to distribute development and production orders worth tens of millions of dollars among Israeli arms manufacturers. The scope of U.S. military sales to Israel will also simultaneously increase.

Quoting high-level security sources, the Israeli press has published certain details about the contracts that have or will be signed. The Air Force will shortly receive the first squadron of modern F-18 jets. Israel Aircraft Industries will develop the Arrow, an interceptor missile, for the Pentagon. This project, which will be implemented within the Star Wars program, will cost some $420 million.

The Israeli authorities welcomed the agreement with great fanfare, since this U.S. patron, which sells its weapons not only to Israel but also to numerous Arab countries, reiterated that Israel is still at the top of its priorities. It is doubtful, however, that the Israeli people have any special reason to rejoice. After all, any further expansion of the military cooperation between their country and the United States will only increase their involvement in the promotion of U.S. imperialist interests in the Middle East. These interests are incompatible with Israel's basic interest, the interest of peace and real security. At the same time, Israel will increasingly become a warehouse for U.S. weapons and a bridgehead of the policy of neoglobalism.

It should be noted at this point that as early as a year ago the Israeli and Western press published dozens of articles about Israeli-U.S. agreements regarding the positioning of weapons for U.S. forces in the Middle East in warehouses in Israel. These agreements stipulated that the

IDF [Israel Defense Force] would also be able to use these warehouses in times of need, a move which could drag Israel into U.S. armed adventures even outside the boundaries of the region.

Upon granting it the status of privileged ally, the U.S. Administration reserved for Israel the role of advance party of the imperialist forces, a tool in the hands of the imperialists in Washington. The U.S. monthly PROGRESSIVE notes in this context that the special relations between the United States and Israel are based on a strategic approach formulated in Washington as early as the 1950's that stipulates a strong and pro-American Israel is the best barrier to curb the rise of the radical Arab movement in the Middle East, a movement the United States considers dangerous to its economic and strategic interests in the region.

The Israeli public also knows very well the price of cooperation with U.S. imperialism. The billions of dollars in aid Israel receives every year from the United States, THE JERUSALEM POST writes, are not given as a favor since, Israel pays for it with the blood of its soldiers and by promoting the goals of U.S. policy in the Middle East. As a result of the policy of serving U.S. imperialism, Israel since its inception has lived between wars. Or, in the words of Meir Vilner, the secretary general of the Israeli Communist Party: Zionism, which promised Jews a refuge in the land of Israel, brought matters to a point where Israel has become a very unsafe place for Jews to live.

DRA Military Operation Planned for East Border

LD152123 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 15 Dec 87

[From the "Vremya" newscast; M. Leshchinskiy video report from Eastern Afghanistan]

[Text] [Leshchinskiy] The roads run from here, the central circular area of Gardez, to all four parts of the globe. Three of these roads have been peaceful for a long time; peaceful cargoes travel along them. Only one, that which runs to the east of the country, to the Pakistani border, remains a military road.

For 9 years armed groupings of the Zadran tribe, whose lands run alongside the border, have been blocking this road that leads to the Khost district from the central regions of the country. Once the tribe was equipped with the latest Stinger and Blowpipe antiaircraft missiles, they were also able to block the air routes to Khost. Forty thousand people have found themselves checked by this blockade without food, fuel, and the essentials they require.

Now, after a decision of the Grand Assembly, which was held in Kabul, a major military-political operation is planned here. However, in the spirit of the policy of national consent, it has been decided to hold intensive peace talks with the participation of the elders, the most respected people from the two sides. Intelligence data shows that, under pressure from Pakistan and from the counterrevolutionary leaders, feverish military preparations are now being carried out by the military Zadran. Powerful reinforced areas have been created there, and a military grouping nearly 10,000-strong has been put together. This information is confirmed by people who are bringing more and more negative responses from the other side to the peace proposals.

The deadline for talks, set by the representatives of the people in Kabul, is quickly running out.

Sub-Saharan Africa

USSR To 'Help Exploit' Angolan Diamond Mines

AU161152 Paris AFP in English 1147 GMT 16 Dec 87

[Text] Lisbon, Dec 16 (AFP)—The Soviet Union has agreed to help exploit Angola's diamond and quartz mines, the state news agency ANGOP said in a report received here Wednesday.

Angola's diamond output has slackened considerably in recent years because of raids by the U.S. and South African-backed guerrilla movement UNITA [National Union for the Total Independence of Angola].

Under an agreement signed in Luanda on Monday, the agency said, the Soviet Union is to take a stake in the capital of Angolan mining companies, and will produce a detailed geological survey map of the African country.

Signatories were Angolan Industry Minister Henrique Santos and Soviet Geology Minister Yevgeniy Kozlovsky.

USSR, Nigeria Sign MFN-Trade Agreement

LD130031 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1250 GMT 12 Dec 87

[Text] Lagos, 12 Dec (TASS)—The Soviet Union and Nigeria have agreed to the mutual introduction in bilateral trade of most favored nation status. This is provided for in a trade agreement signed in Abuja Thursday [December 10] between the two countries. This agreement is one more significant milestone in the history of Soviet-Nigerian relations, stressed Sumaila Mamman, Nigerian minister of trade, at the ceremony which took place. He noted that mutually profitable links in the economic and cultural spheres have formed between our countries; this is seen in the construction of the metallurgical factory in Ajaokuta and in the exchange of delegations.

The signed agreement, said Sumaila Mamman, serves the interests of the people of the USSR and of Nigeria. He confirmed the determination of the Republic's government to make efforts together with the Soviet Union to establish a new international economic order.

Zambia's Kaunda, Voskanyan Welcome INF Treaty

PM161105 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Dec 87 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Delegation Received"]

[Text] Lusaka, 12 Dec—Kenneth Kaunda, OAU president and president of the Republic of Zambia, today received the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation headed by G.M. Voskanyan, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

We welcome the signing of the Treaty on the Elimination of Soviet and U.S. Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles, he stated. This act is a gigantic step forward in the cause of nuclear disarmament, in accord with the interests of all mankind. The head of state expressed confidence that the first agreement in this sphere would be followed by new accords between the USSR and the United States. He highly appraised the Soviet leadership's peace-loving policy and its tireless efforts to achieve a world without weapons and without wars.

Very warm relations of friendship have developed between the USSR and Zambia, K. Kaunda said. We highly value this friendship, which is based on fundamental principles. He emphasized the major importance for bilateral relations of the meetings and talks held in Moscow during the Zambian president's recent friendly working visit to the USSR. K. Kaunda expressed confidence that the current visit by Soviet parliamentarians will serve the further strengthening of Soviet-Zambian ties.

Mali Premier Receives Belyakov, CPSU Group

PM151359 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Dec 87 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Conversation Held"]

[Text] Bamako, 11 Dec—Mamadou Dembele, prime minister of Mali, has received a CPSU delegation headed by A. M. Belyakov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Buryat CPSU Obkom, which is paying a visit here in accordance with the plan for party ties between the CPSU and the Mali People's Democratic Union.

During their conversation he stressed the historic significance of the Treaty Between the USSR and the United States on Eliminating Medium and Shorter-Range Missiles. This is yet further convincing proof of the triumph of the Soviet state's consistent peace-loving policy, the head of government observed.

Delegation Concludes Visit

PM141537 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Dec 87 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] Bamako, 12 Dec—The visit to the Republic of Mali by a CPSU delegation headed by A. M. Belyakov, first secretary of Buryat CPSU Obkom, has ended. The delegation was here in accordance with the plan for party ties between the CPSU and the Mali People's Democratic Union [UDPM].

The delegation's members were the guests of honor at yesterday's opening of the regular session of Mali's National Assembly. Welcoming the Soviet guests, Sidiki Diarra, member of the UDPM Central Executive Bureau and president of the Republic's National Assembly, appraised highly the state of Soviet-Malian relations. He expressed gratitude to the Soviet people for the assistance and support rendered to Mali in the implementation of national development plans.

The CPSU delegation departed for home Friday. It was seen off at the airport by Sekou Minandiou Traore, secretary of the UDPM Central Executive Bureau for Foreign Relations, and other officials.

The CPSU delegation headed by A. M. Belyakov, first secretary of Buryat CPSU Obkom, returned to Moscow on 12 December. The delegation traveled to Mali in accordance with the plan for ties between the CPSU and the UDPM.

Chikin Heads Delegation to Martinique Congress

PM151355 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Dec 87 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report under the general heading "Interparty Ties"]

[Text] A CPSU delegation headed by V. V. Chikin, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee and chief editor of SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, left Moscow for Martinique on 11 December to take part in the work of the Ninth Communist Party of Martinique Congress at the invitation of that party's Central Committee.

East Europe

GDR, SED Hail Gorbachev U.S. Trip Results

LD160911 Moscow TASS in English 0827 GMT 16 Dec 87

[Text] Berlin December 16 TASS—The Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany ,the State Council and the Council of Ministers of the German Democratic Republic have expressed a high opinion of the results of a recent visit by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to the United States.

They said in a joint statement issued here that the results of his talks there, most notably the INF (Intermediate-Range Nuclear Force) Treaty, were a victory for the cause of peace and international security.

The statement, which was basically on the recent Berlin meeting of leading figures from the Warsaw treaty member nations, said that meeting had represented further evidence of successful joint activities by socialist countries, their fraternal friendship and comradely cooperation.

GDR Official, Press Cited on INF Treaty

PM151159 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Dec 87 Morning Edition p 3

[IZVESTIYA correspondent V. Lapskiy dispatch under general headline: "Treaty Inspiring Hope"]

[Text] Berlin—At this time, nothing is the topic of more talk in Berlin than M.S. Gorbachev's visit to the United States and the signing of the Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles. The concord achieved in Washington regarding the destruction of two classes of nuclear weapons is assessed highly and inspires in GDR citizens optimism and hope for a more reliable and happy future.

At a press conference in Berlin a representative of the GDR Foreign Ministry Ambassador Wolfgang Meyer stated that the GDR unreservedly supports and welcomes the treaty signed in Washington and sees in it a historic landmark on the path to a nuclear-free world. We express our thanks to all those who, with a sense of realism and readiness to compromise during the long and extremely complicated negotiations, arrived at this agreement. Our appreciation, W. Meyer stressed, is primarily addressed to the Soviet Union's constructive policy which has truly demonstrated the new political thinking in the approach to the solution of the present day's most important problem. The GDR supports this policy in word and deed.

Peace has become more reliable today, the BERLINER ZEITUNG writes. The television hookup joining Washington with many of the planet's countries enabled us to witness a historic moment. The signing of the Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles undoubtedly signifies the first real step to eliminating nuclear arsenals. Indeed, it was shown that steps can be made in this direction without causing each other any harm. The citizens of the GDR, one of the nine countries from which, according to the agreement, nuclear weapons will be withdrawn, fully approve of and support the treaty. There is no doubt that it will change the strategic situation in Europe for the better for which the proposal by the GDR and CSSR on the creation in the center of the continent of a zone free of nuclear weapons has particular topicality now.

The atmosphere of the third meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan, and also the impetus spread by it, NEUES DEUTSCHLAND writes, increases the expectation that the CPSU Central Committee general secretary and the U.S. President will continue their dialogue in the same spirit in the Kremlin in 1988 and will reach new accords on the matter of ridding the planet of lethal weapons.

Jaruzelski Addresses Central Committee Plenum

LD152204 Moscow TASS in English 1825 GMT 15 Dec 87

[Text] Warsaw December 15 TASS—Wojciech Jaruzelski, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party (PUWP), speaking at a plenary meeting of the PUWP Central Committee today, pointed out a great importance of the treaty signed by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and by President Ronald Reagan of the United States on the elimination of intermediate- and shorter-range missiles.

"The December 1987," he said, "showed to everyone that although a world without nuclear weapons is still far away, it for the first time became one step more probable. This is a vivid proof of the correctness and effectiveness of the foreign policy of the Soviet Union and of the entire socialist community. This is, at the same time, a projection into the future. A new step of socialism's peace drive begins".

Wojciech Jaruzelski specially emphasized the importance of the Berlin meeting of the leading figures of the Warsaw treaty member states. It became yet another example of the new style of allied contacts and consultations, the expression of mutual trust and respect, and increasingly wide utilization of close and direct forms of cooperation.

"Our party, the government, and all Polish people greeted with great satisfaction the transition to the elimination of two types of nuclear missiles, and regarded with respect and gratitude the decisions taken by the leaders of the two great powers", he went on to say.

"When about two years ago Mikhail Gorbachev came forward with a concept of a world free from nuclear weapons, most people recognized the idea as the only real alternative to the threat of nuclear destruction. At present, under the conditions of the climate created by his visit to Washington, this peace drive acquires a still greater importance. This way is not as easy a one as before. The problems of reducing strategic arms, eliminating chemical weapons, ending nuclear tests, and consolidating the foundations of European security, including complex issues concerning a rational reduction in conventional arms, await their solution".

"We are aware of the great historical responsibility which rests with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries", Wojciech Jaruzelski pointed out. "This requires unbreakable unity of our parties and coordination of their actions and initiatives which are being embodied together in the dynamics of the great peace drive of socialism. Poland will continue to make every effort actively to contribute to this great cause".

Touching upon the referendum results, Wojciech Jaruzelski said the decision to hold it was correct. "To listen to the voice of the people and to respect the opinion of the working class and the population is one of the basic principles of the Marxist-Leninist party. There are no grounds to assert that the population of the Polish People's Republic is against reforms. On the contrary, the Polish people declare for reforms and for democratic changes. Reforms are a vital necessity and at the same time an objective law governing the development of socialism. However, the fact that part of the population have doubts and misgivings about ways of implementing the processes of changes cannot be removed from the agenda".

"There is not the slightest doubt that the referendum became an unusually important and positive event. It aroused a great political eagerness, and designated new areas for a large-scale, nation-wide dialogue. As a result of the referendum, a kind of coalition of the forces of supporters of the reform, encompassing millions-strong masses of the public with an active and creative attitude to reality, has come into view".

"The referendum", Wojciech Jaruzelski said, "once again showed the political fruitlessness of anti-socialist forces of boycott and negation".

"The policy of reform is the party's policy. The implementation of this policy calls for winning public support and creating a large-scale public movement for reforms", the Polish leader pointed out.

Polish Council of Ministers Plan Adopted

LD151907 Moscow TASS in English 1835 GMT 15 Dec 87

[Text] Warsaw December 15 TASS—At a meeting here the Council of Ministers of the Polish People's Republic has considered and adopted a central plan for 1988.

The plan envisages the attainment of the main goals of socio-economic development and, first of all, a rise in the living standard of the population and acceleration of the process of achieving a balanced economy.

A report published in the press today points out that the character of the plan was influenced by the referendum of November 29, 1987.

The referendum results, while indicating people's widespread support for the programme of economic reforms, at the same time confronted the government with the task of softening the sharpness of measures being suggested in the policy of incomes and prices. A radical change of prices is extended for a period of three years, the report points out.

Next year's plan envisages a 27-per cent increase in retail prices from January 1, 1988, counting out spirits and tobacco products. At the same time provision is made for an automatic compensation for this increase for all workers in the socialized sector and for pensioners in accordance with the principles submitted prior to the referendum.

It is planned to maintain a real bonus in the socialized sector next year at a level not lower than this year's, with exception of consequences of the increase in the prices of spirits and tobacco products.

In future, national income will grow by 3.2-3.8 per cent while income intended for distribution will go up by 2.7-3.3 per cent. The delivery of commodities to the market (counting out spirits and tobacco products) will increase by 3.4-4 per cent, and services will grow by 5-5.5 per cent. Public health, environmental protection, and housing construction remain priority fields in the national economic development plan. It is planned to build 203,000 apartments in 1988.

Dynamic economic development, the report says, is possible only with a corresponding rise in labour productivity which will go up by 3.1-3.7 per cent next year with a simultaneous decrease in power- and materials-intensiveness of production by 1.2-1.9 per cent.

Warsaw Correspondent Assesses Referendum

LD141548 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0630 GMT 14 Dec 87

[From the "News of Communist Countries" program, with unidentified presenter]

[Text] [Presenter] We have included a report from Poland in this program. As you probably know, a referendum on the pace of the forthcoming economic reform and the democratization of public life took place at the end of November there. The majority of those who voted said yes, yet not all people voted, and those who said yes constitute a minority in relation to the total number of those entitled to vote. What will happen to the reform? We asked our Warsaw correspondent Vasiliy Lesovik.

[Lesovik] Immediately after the referendum, wild passions flared up in the press and at the Sejm session itself concerning the principle of conducting the referendum. Many participants in the referendum and a number of deputies think that in its decision on the principal rules for conducting the referendum the Sejm put too much stress on registering the total number of voters.

[Presenter] Speaking about other countries, I have never heard, it seems, that they ever counted the number of those who did not turn up to cast their votes as strictly as they did in Poland.

[Lesovik] Precisely. That is why many people are asking: Why is it that those who showed apathy, indifference, or simply civic immaturity should affect the results of the voting? The decision should rest with those who have won the battle of opinions directly at the ballot boxes. However, the rules were precisely like that, and everyone had to take them into consideration. The government was confronted with a difficult task. The program of radical reform that it has developed, especially the part that determines the time of its implementation, has to be modified so as not to deceive those among the population who have pinned their hopes on it, that is, the majority of those who voted. At the same time, one cannot ignore those who suggested a more resilient introduction of certain decisions, first of all in the area of increasing prices on basic food and industrial items, and removing government subsidies for their production.

[Presenter] What shape will the reform take now?

[Lesovik] Without deviating from the main principles and pace of the comprehensive restructuring of the economy, it is being contemplated to spread the price increase over a longer period, while providing compensations in salaries as was mapped out earlier. There are also plans to allocate more funds to housing construction by shortening the list of industrial projects to be built. More funds from the budget than was planned in the initial program will have to be used as subsidies for the production of a number of industrial and food items. According to specialists, all this will have a negative effect on the reform by causing the percent of national income growth to drop, and by making attempts to balance the country's budget more difficult. A corrected program, worked out in detail, and a draft 1988 budget will be submitted at the next Sejm session.

CSSR's Bilak Praises Bilateral Relations

LD152324 Moscow TASS in English 2230 GMT 15 Dec 87

[Text] Prague December 15 TASS—Revolutionary transformations taking place in the Soviet Union evoked huge interest in the socialist countries and all over the world. Czechoslovak society, too, embarked on the road of the acceleration of social and economic development, Member of the Presidium, Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia Vasil Bilak said here, delivering a report at the tenth congress of the Czechoslovak-Soviet Friendship Union. Definite circles in the West accuse Czechoslovakia of the fact that restructuring in the country, allegedly, proceeds at a slower pace than in the USSR, V. Bilak said. It will not be amiss to recall that quite recently the same voices accused Czechoslovakia of imitating the Soviet Union. "Restructuring underway in the USSR is of huge importance for us, for we should be able to use creatively the experience of the Soviet friends, to apply it correctly in conditions of our country", he said.

"Anniversaries of important events will be observed in the coming year, 1988—the 70th anniversary of the foundation of the Czechoslovak Republic, the 50th anniversary of the criminal Munich collusion, the 40th anniversary of the victorious February and the 20th anniversary of the January (1968) plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia," the speaker said. The enemies of Czechoslovakia will, undoubtedly, do their utmost to use them in their purposes. This applies particularly to the year 1968, so it is important to emphasize now that January 1968 was objectively needed for rectifying errors and distortions that had been made in the previous period, the speaker said.

When the crisis was mounting, the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia was ideologically weakened. Persons guided by anti-socialist principles got into the Central Committee and the Presidium of the Central Committee. "We know now that these forces were seeking to weaken socialism, supported nationalists and anti-Soviet attitudes, challenged the leading reloe of the Communist Party."

"Calls for reassessing these events, for reviewing and calling in question the document 'the lessons of the crises development in the party and society in the period after the 13th Congress of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia' have been sounding ever more often at anti-communist centres of late. We are not against research and debates around the document. But this is an irrefutable fact that an anti-communist coalition was formed in Czechoslovakia in 1968 with a view to undermining socialist system."

"Certain persons try to compare the changes taking place in the USSR with the 1968 events in Czechoslovakia. They lose sight of the fact that the removal of the consequences of the period of stagnation is conducted in the Soviet Union under the leadership of the Communist Party, while everything that was leading to the restoration of capitalism and elimination of socialism was encouraged in Czechoslovakia in 1968. The attempts to draw parallels, to compare restructuring in the USSR to what took palce in Czechoslovakia in 1968 mean to distort the truth and not to respect human reason."

The 14th congress and subsequent congresses of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia duly assessed the 1968 events. Unity of the party and its ties with the people strengthened on these principles. The attempts to review or justify the policy to which hundreds of thousands of deceived people fell victim have no prospects.

"Our friendship with the Soviet Union formed not under pressure but on the basis of profound historic experience," V. Bilak said. It was borne [as received] of the understanding by the whole people of the truth that the USSR is the most loyal friend and that we shall always be forging ahead shoulder-to-shoulder with the Soviet Union. Every true patriot, everyone who loves his motherland, wants it to have a reliable ally. The Soviet Union is such an ally for us and we shall do everything to strengthen and deepen fraternal friendship with the Soviet Union," V. Bilak said.

Topics for RCP Conference Debate Outlined

PM150943 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Dec 87 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "RCP Central Committee Plenum Met"]

[Text] Bucharest, 13 Dec—A plenum of the RCP Central Committee met here today and approved the documents that will be submitted for discussion by the RCP national conference which opens 14 December.

The documents examine questions of the development and improvement of production forces and production and social relations. The conference will also discuss the progress of the implementation of the decisions of the 13th RCP Congress and of the party program for the socioeconomic development of the country and its various regions.

Ceausescu Reports to RCP National Conference

PM151747 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Dec 87 Second Edition p 4

[Report by PRAVDA special correspondent S. Petukhov and TASS special correspondent O. Shirokov: "RCP National Conference"]

[Text] Bucharest, 14 Dec—The RCP national conference started work here today, in the Palace of the Republic. It is being attended by around 3,000 delegates and over 1,000 guests representing the party organizations of all 40 judets and the municipality of Bucharest.

The party conference is to discuss topical problems of socialist building in the country and the process of implementing socioeconomic development plans and to formulate measures on the implementation of the targets of the current 5-year plan and the decisions of the 13th party congress.

RCP Secretary General N. Ceausescu delivered the report.

Romania has reached, the report says, a decisive phase in the building of a developed socialist society. In accordance with the party's course, the country must become a medium-developed socialist country by 1990, and all the objective conditions for that exist. Considerable successes were achieved in the national economy in the first 2 years of the current 5-year plan. Commodity output in industry increased by more than 10% and in agriculture by nearly 20%. Labor productivity improved and the national income grew substantially. But a number of indicators fell short of the planned marks and the real potential of the Republic's economy. The keynote speaker pointed out serious shortcomings in the work of industrial enterprises and in the commissioning of new capacities, and he called for effective measures to organize production, introduce new technology and automation facilities, and strengthen discipline and responsibility.

In agriculture, the report goes on to say, there are a number of negative phenomena alongside the positive results of the first 2 years. The tasks of the new agrarian revolution demand a large increase in the output of fields and livestock units and the provision of the country's needs for vegetables, milk, and meat.

The speaker drew attention to serious laggardness in the capital construction sphere. In implementing the directives of the 13th RCP Congress, he said, we are seeking with the utmost determination to ensure the harmonious and comprehensive development of every judet through the rational siting of industrial and agricultural zones.

In the section on Romanian foreign economic links N. Ceausescu stressed that an important part is played in this sphere by Romania's active involvement in the activity of CEMA and in the implementation of the Comprehensive Program for CEMA Countries' Scientific and Technical Progress Through the Year 2000.

Recently, the keynote speaker stated, there has been an event of worldwide-historic significance—the signing of the Treaty Between the USSR and the United States on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles. This victory for a realistic policy and for the actions of all the peoples should give new momentum to the struggle of the broad antinuclear front and the broad peace front.

From the lofty platform of the RCP national conference, the speaker said, on behalf of the Romanian people we heartily congratulate the Soviet Union and the United States on the signing of the Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles. At the same time, the speaker said, we must make a bigger effort to achieve new agreements for the purpose of the gradual elimination of all nuclear armaments and the renunciation once and for all of the militarization of space. The states of Europe, where many types of nuclear weapons are stockpiled, have a special responsibility. It is impossible, N. Ceausescu said, to understand statements by the politicians of certain states asserting that they will continue to produce and refine nuclear weapons. In present conditions there is not and cannot be a more important problem than the complete elimination of nuclear weapons in Europe and worldwide.

Romania, the speaker continued, will continue to advocate the widening of relations with all the socialist countries and the strengthening of their unity and solidarity.

West Europe

Shultz Arrives in FRG To Discuss Summit

LD151221 Moscow TASS in English 1219 GMT 15 Dec 87

[Text] Bonn December 15 TASS—U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz today arrived in Bonn.

Friedhelm Ost, official spokesman for the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, said Shultz would meet with Chancellor Helmut Kohl, Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher and Defense Minister Manfred Woerner.

According to Ost, the state secretary would brief them on the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Washington. The West German representatives intended to ask him, in particular, about some issues concerning human rights covered at the summit.

The spokesman said that during his meeting with Shultz, Kohl was going to stress this country's interest in further disarmament steps.

Wire services reported that President Reagan had briefed Kohl on the results of his talks with the Soviet leader in a telephone call last Friday.

Shultz, who is touring Western Europe, came to Bonn from Oslo where he had met with representatives of the Norwegian Government. The state secretary also visited Denmark and held talks with Foreign Minister Uffe Elleman-Jensen in Copenhagen Saturday.

Tonight Shultz will go to Ondon for a meeting with Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher and other members of the British Cabinet.

Meets With Kohl, Ministers

LD151752 Moscow TASS in English 1722 GMT 15 Dec 87

[Text] Bonn December 15 TASS—The importance of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Washington and of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles were the focus of attention here today during the meeting between U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz and Hans-Dietrich Genscher, the FRG's minister of foreign affairs.

The West German Foreign Ministry reported that the sides were unanimous that the "double zero option" concerning intermediate- and shorter-range missiles should be followed by further steps on disarmament. They declared for a 50-per cent cut in strategic offensive arms of the two great powers.

There was an exchange of views on issues connected with tactical nuclear weapons on the basis of the decisions of the Brussels session of the NATO Council at foreign ministers' level.

Genscher declared for the earliest conclusion of a treaty on universal elimination of chemical weapons. He welcomed the progress achieved at the Vienna talks on a reduction in the armed forces and armaments.

The FRG's foreign minister informed Shultz of West German-Soviet relations, emphasizing their importance. The interlocutors also exchanged views on matters concerning the United States' and the Federal Republic's relations with the Warsaw treaty countries.

During the meeting between Mr Shultz and Manfred Woerner, the FRG's minister of defence, the latter again advocated NATO's military strategy which would envisage the preservation of nuclear weapons. His opinion is that this is essential for ensuring the West's security.

As is clear from a report by a spokesman for the FRG's Defence Ministry, the sides positively evaluated the INF Treaty but sought, however, to portray the signing of the treaty as being exclusively to the credit of NATO. They again spoke of a certain 'invasion capability' of the Warsaw treaty organisation.

In this connection Shultz and Woerner called for maintaining 'NATO's defence capability at forward lines in Europe', emphasizing that the presence of U.S. troops on the European continent was an integral prerequisite for that.

Shultz, who is touring a number of West European countries also met with the FRG's Chancellor Helmut Kohl.

Criticism Forces Chirac To Soften INF Stance

PM161055 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Dec 87 Second Edition p 5

[Own correspondent V. Bolshakov dispatch: "Parisian Grumbling"]

[Text] Paris, 15 Dec—French Prime Minister J. Chirac's Saturday speech to students of a military research institute was a tribute to annual tradition and promised no sensations. However, there were at once two sensations in that speech.

First, J. Chirac declared that "in the event of the FRG becoming a victim of aggression" no one must be in any doubt that France will act in its defense "immediately and unconditionally," for "there cannot be a separate battle for Germany and a separate one for France." As the newspaper LE MATIN DE PARIS writes in this connection, "never before has a single French prime minister so resolutely and publicly made" such a pledge.

Second, J. Chirac declared that the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles "represents a challenge to Europe." And Europe can only respond to it, in the prime minister's view, by strengthening its defense, particularly through further military integration between the FRG and France.

After U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz had his first conversation with the NATO countries' foreign ministers in Brussels last Friday to brief them on the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, the INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE carried a report entitled "But France Grumbles." It wrote that, despite approval in principle for the Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles, the French Government spokesman insisted that the joint communique not call that agreement "historic...." But, of course, such "editing" did not prevent this first treaty on the elimination of an entire class of nuclear arms from becoming historic at the very moment of signing. But, as a French saying goes, "every village has its own popular belief," and if the French Foreign Ministry keeps to its own opinion, that is up to it....

As is known, Paris had long been "grumbling" about the elimination of medium-and shorter-range missiles. But now it seemed that, having been convinced of the unanimous support for this decision on the part of all the NATO countries, Paris would abandon its attempts to discredit it. And this was the drift, incidentally, of a recent speech by French President F. Mitterrand, who declared full approval for the Soviet-U.S. agreement.

That allusion was too transparent for people not to realize to whom it was addressed. Questions of disarmament are becoming a very serious aspect of the campaign for the presidential election to be held in a few months' time. It is obvious that the president and the prime minister, who, as L'HUMANITE writes, were in full agreement in principle when putting through parliament the Fr500-billion program of superarmaments for 1987-1991, now differ in their attitude to precisely the two aspects of French policy about which J. Chirac caused a sensation in his speech.

Differences of principle or tactical differences?

According to the French Communists' analysis, they are purely tactical, for both F. Mitterrand and J. Chirac are in full agreement on improving and building up France's nuclear arsenal, continuing the French nuclear tests, and creating joint military formations with the FRG. However, a number of commentators believe that they have recently been assuming the nature of differences of principle as well.

The premier's speech has aroused serious concern in France, where the movement in favor of Paris' more active participation in the disarmament talks has recently been growing stronger. L'HUMANITE writes that in their recent statements France's leaders have virtually taken a "hawkish" stand with regard to disarmament.

It must be said that such criticism made the head of government modify his stand somewhat with regard to the Soviet-U.S. agreement on Monday. Replying to a direct question from journalists about the prime minister's assessment of statements by those who compare the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles with a "new Munich" for West Europe, Jacques Chirac declared that the comparison with Munich is simply absurd. The treaty signed in Washington undoubtedly marks an important and, I would even say, historic stage. It is a very significant event. The treaty has undoubted positive aspects. It is consistent and logical and accords with the aims originally set. It satisfies our European partners.

As for France's role, J. Chirac made it clear that its leadership is not thinking of actively involving the country in the disarmament process, preferring its position as a detached observer.

As we see, the Parisian grumbling is a far from harmless matter.

Chirac 'Glad' About Treaty

PM161021 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Dec 87 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Significant Event"]

[Text] Paris, 15 Dec—Mr Prime Minister, how do you regard the statements by those people who compare the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Medium-and Shorter-Range Missiles with a "new Munich" for Western Europe?—this question was put to Jacques Chirac, head of the French Government, at a press conference at the French Diplomatic Press Association.

I think that we must refrain from drawing parallels between events which have nothing in common, the prime minister replied. A comparison with Munich is simply ridiculous. The treaty signed in Washington is indisputably an important, I would even say historic, stage. It is a very significant event. The treaty has undoubted positive aspects. It is consistent and logical and conforms with the aims set at the start. It satisfies our European partners. Finally, it includes a certain number of quite new terms concerning verification. Therefore we can only be glad at the conclusion of this treaty.

As for France's role, as J. Chirac gave it to be understood, its leadership is not thinking of actively including the country in the disarmament process, preferring the position of a detached observer, at best a neutral onlooker of the evolution of the situation.

French Socialist Cited on Arms Control Policy

PM161035 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Dec 87 Morning Edition p 6

[Own correspondent Yu. Kovalenko article under the rubric "Facts, Events, Opinions": "Changes in the 'Strategic Landscape'"]

[Text] Paris—L. Jospin, first secretary of the French Socialist Party (PS), has published an article in LE MONDE in which he gives the party's view on disarmament problems.

The Washington meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan, L. Jospin notes, will be the stage that will lead on to fundamental changes in the "world strategic landscape." He is against the experts and right-wing political figures who are opposed to the Soviet-American agreement on the grounds that it will supposedly lead to Western Europe becoming isolated from the United States. Their logic, the first secretary of the PS points out, is to reject any form of disarmament. They fear all Soviet foreign policy initiatives, while they themselves offer nothing at all.

At the same time, L. Jospin confirmed the Socialist Party's loyalty to the doctrine of nuclear deterrence in this article. It is possible that future generations will live in a world free of all weapons, he points out, but at present the total elimination of nuclear arsenals would have a destabilizing effect on our world.

France is not part of the NATO military organization, but nevertheless influential military-political circles want to adopt the NATO doctrine which incorporates a strategy of flexible response, limited nuclear war, and so forth. As far as a cut in tactical missiles is concerned, if the USSR and the United States take this course should we necessarily be opposed to it? he asks in the article.

L. Jospin favors seeking equilibrium with the Warsaw Pact countries in conventional arms at the lowest possible level. He notes that with regard to chemical weapons France's sole aim must be to ensure their destruction. The first secretary raises the question of France signing the Moscow treaty to ban nuclear weapon tests in the three environments and the Nonproliferation Treaty.

While underlining his opposition to France returning to NATO, L. Jospin also supports the creation of Eurodefense which, according to him, will be the military and political completion of the process of building an independent Europe, although he points out that he advocates a policy of "small steps" in this area.

Shevardnadze, Spain's Yanez Discuss INF

LD151720 Moscow TASS in English 1649 GMT 15 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 15 TASS—Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, received Luis Yanez, Spanish secretary of state for international cooperation and relations with Latin America, here today.

Some topical international problems were considered within the context of results of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Washington.

Eduard Shevardnadze described the course and results of Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to the United States. It was pointed out that the accords reached in Washington create favourable conditions for headway in other directions leading to curtailment of the arms race and, first of all, such fields as a ban on and elimination of chemical weapons, an end to nuclear tests, and reduction in the armed forces and armaments in Europe.

Luis Yanez on behalf of the Spanish leadership expressed full support for the Treaty Between the Soviet Union and the United States on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles. Mutual opinion was expressed that the signing of the treaty is a historic step on the way to cessation of the nuclear arms race and to disarmament.

Ways for a possible settlement of crisis situations in various parts of the world, in Central America, in particular, were discussed in a constructive spirit.

The sides declared for further expansion of the Soviet-Spanish political dialogue and for more active contacts and mutually beneficial cooperation between the two countries in most diverse fields.

Belgian 'Readiness To Accept F-16's' Noted

PM151415 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Dec 87 Second Edition p 6

[Own correspondent V. Chernyshev dispatch: "Aircraft To Replace the Missiles?"]

[Text] Madrid, 13 Dec—The news that the Belgian Defense Ministry has expressed readiness to accept the 72 U.S. F-16 aircraft currently deployed at the U.S. military base at Torrejon de Ardoz near Madrid has caused surprise in Spanish diplomatic circles. With reference to a report published in the Belgian newspaper MORGEN, the Brussels correspondent of the Madrid newspaper DIARIO 16 writes that according to the plans of the Belgian Defense Ministry the U.S. aircraft could be transferred to Florennes. The Madrid newspaper EL PAIS carries a similar report.

Spain is seeking a reduction of the U.S. military presence on its territory, and specifically the withdrawal of all the 72 U.S. aircraft from the Torrejon base. This was discussed during the seven rounds of talks between the two countries' delegations which ended inconclusively. Madrid has raised this question as an indispensible precondition of the conclusion of a new bilateral treaty between Spain and the United States to replace the old treaty which expires in May 1988 and under which U.S. bases are sited on Spanish territory. However, as has been stated in Spanish official circles, in conducting its talks with Washington Madrid does not intend to discuss the question as to which country and specific location the Pentagon may transfer its aircraft.

Meanwhile, MORGEN reports that the Belgian Government has carried out a feasibility study of the future use of the Florennes base, where 16 U.S. nuclear missiles of a planned 48 are currently sited. These missiles are to be destroyed in compliance with the treaty between the USSR and the United States, which has just been signed by the two countries' leaders in Washington. The document cited by MORGEN examines the possibility of the 1,100 U.S. servicemen currently stationed in Florennes servicing in the future not only the 72 F-16 aircraft after their transfer from Torrejon but also 44 more such machines which are to arrive here in 1988 as well as several "Mirages" already deployed at the base. "The nuclear weapons which the F-16 could take on board in the event of a crisis, EL PAIS writes, are stored at arms dumps in Italy and Turkey, and the distance which separates these countries from Spain is more or less the same as the distance which separates them from Belgium."

TASS Cites Cypriot Paper on NATO Buildup

LD151040 Moscow TASS in English 1013 GMT 15 Dec 87

[Text] Nicosia December 15 TASS—The Cypriot newspaper KHARAVYI has described as dangerous the stepped-up activity of NATO's military bases in the Mediterranean lately.

Under the guise of a regular air exercise, for example, the United States and Britain have increased their military presence at the British military base Akrotiri in the south of Cyprus even further, by bringing in further aircraft and other military equipment there.

The paper said the leading NATO powers' goal was to increase NATO control over the Mediterranean, which contradicted the interests of security and peace in the region and just demands by the peoples and governments of Cyprus, Greece and Spain for the removal of NATO bases from their territories.

Expressing common concern about the situation, the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives (parliament) of Cyprus heard a report by the foreign minister and the chief of Cypriot police on the British bases' subversive activities against the security, unity and sovereignty of the Republic of Cyprus and on the responsibility of the Cypriot Government.

Latin America & Caribbean

Nicaragua's Ortega Comments on Current Issues

Interview on Military Plans

PA160039 Moscow in Spanish to Latin America 2324 GMT 15 Dec 87

[Report by Viktor Deruga on Soviet correspondent Yuriy Baranov's interview with Nicaraguan President Daniel Ortega in Managua; date not given—recorded]

[Text] Approximately 2 days ago, the Western media gave a very particular slant to some statements made by Nicaraguan President Daniel Ortega, concerning some Nicaraguan warmongering and even aggressive plans.

From the moment I listened to the reports, I knew that something had not been interpreted well. Today we received a brief interview President Daniel Ortega granted to Yuriy Baranov, our correspondent in Managua. In this interview, President Ortega explained what he had said and put everything into proper perspective. Here is what he said:

[Begin Ortega recording] That is the manipulation that the U.S. Government is conducting by using several U.S. media to [word indistinct] the U.S. Congress now that new points concerning funds for the mercenary forces are being discussed. [end recording]

Excuse us, friends. Our recording is not very good and I believe that it is very important to understand what Daniel Ortega said, so I am going to request my friend and tonight's coworker, announcer Vladimir Peskov to repeat what Daniel Ortega said.

[Peskov] That is the manipulation that the U.S. Government is carrying out by using some of the U.S. media to influence the U.S. Government now that the approval of new funds for the mercenary forces are being discussed.

Nicaragua cannot even dream of having a 600,000-men army, because we only have a population of 3 million people. Our goal is to maintain a small army in accordance with our status, which is that of a country attacked and threatened by imperialism. We indeed want the entire Nicaraguan people to be able to fight and to be trained to fight so that when a larger aggression or an invasion takes place, all Nicaraguans will be in a position to go out and defend the country.

[Deruga] This is what President Daniel Ortega told our correspondent Baranov. Listen to this carefully, dear listeners. That is the important point to be noticed about misinformation. Daniel Ortega was talking about a larger aggression or an invasion and the U.S. propaganda omitted that element and said that Nicaragua had aggressive plans. These are neither innocent nor inoffensive issues.

Criticizes Opposition Groups

PM160951 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Dec 87
Second Edition p 4

[TASS reports: "A Firm Stance"]

[Text] Managua, 14 Dec—While the Nicaraguan Government is making every effort to fulfill the Guatemala Accords on the quest for a lasting peace in Central America, certain opposition parties are taking advantage of the current political situation to create a "home front" in the country, D. Ortega, president of the Republic, said at the closing session of the national trade union assembly.

The opposition realizes, D. Ortega noted, that it is impossible to overthrow people's power and it is living in expectation of armed intervention by the United States. On the other hand, Washington is very much counting on subversive actions by the Nicaraguan opposition.

The Reagan administration, the president said, is devising, with the CIA's assistance, plans to overthrow the Nicaraguan Government in which the internal opposition is allocated an important part to play. The plans include terrorist activity by gangs of mercenaries and actions by the opposition to destabilize the government, as happened in Chile. The plans' purpose is to create dissatisfaction in the country with the leadership's domestic policy, which is supposed to facilitate U.S. armed intervention. Acting as an appendage of armed counterrevolution, the opposition wants to take power away from the Sandinists.

We do not intend, the Nicaraguan leader said, to discuss the question of power since it is the power of the people who won it in a savage struggle against Somocist tyranny. The Nicaraguan Government respects the rights of the civilian opposition but it will not allow them to become representatives of counterrevolutionary gangs calling for direct U.S. aggression.

Washington, 14 Dec—In an interview for THE WASHINGTON POST, Nicaraguan President Daniel Ortega resolutely rejected reports that have appeared recently in the Western press that Nicaragua allegedly intends to conduct a massive buildup of its armed forces. He said that Nicaragua "respects the Central American plan for a peace settlement and is willing to hold talks on arms reductions with neighbors and with the United States."

Rejects Talks With Contras

LD142310 Moscow TASS in English 2307 GMT
14 Dec 87

[Text] Paris December 15 TASS—President Daniel Ortega of Nicaragua put forward the proposal that an agreement on mutual security be concluded between Nicaragua and the USA. Speaking in an interview with the newspaper LE MONDE, he pointed out that such a treaty should be aimed in a long-term perspective at ending any foreign military presence in Central America. It is necessary, in the first place, to establish strict norms as regards the presence of foreign troops and military advisors in the region and the armament issues. Daniel Ortega pointed to the need for prohibiting the deployment of foreign military bases in Central America. Thus, the Nicaraguan leader stressed, it is possible to establish an equilibrium of forces in the region and start normalizing relations between the USA and Nicaragua.

Simultaneously, the Nicaraguan president pointed out that the United States is doing its utmost to foil the process of peaceful settlement in Central America, is trying to frustrate the ceasefire terms in the region, set under the Guatemala agreements until January 15 next year. If Washington honours the Guatemalan peaceful settlement plan and ends its aid to the contras it will be possible to establish peace in Central America within a short time, failing which the conflict will continue, Daniel Ortega stressed. The Nicaraguan president rejected the possibility of direct talks with the contras, who are only a tool used by the USA for destroying the Nicaraguan Revolution. The contras should lay down arms and take advantage of the amnesty announced in Nicaragua. In that case they will be allowed to participate in the country's political life on the same footing as the opposition parties in Nicaragua, President Daniel Ortega stressed.

Nicaragua's Ramirez Ready for Contras Talks

LD142252 Moscow TASS in English 2247 GMT
14 Dec 87

[Text] Havana December 15 TASS—The Nicaraguan Government is prepared to discuss with armed counterrevolution the terms of ceasefire but will never, under no circumstances engage itself in discussions with it on questions of home policy which are regulated by the Constitution in force. Nicaragua's Vice President Sergio Ramirez said in an interview with the newspaper GRANMA.[sentence as received] He is staying in the Cuban capital as a guest of honour of the ninth international festival of new Latin American cinema.

The signing in August this year of the Guatemalan agreements, he said, has been an expression of goodwill by the governments of the Central American nations directed at a search of ways for a peaceful settlement of the crisis in the region. Yet the process is under a permanent threat of interference on the part of the USA. From the very start we witnessed how the American

Government permanently boycotted that document trying to delay or frustrate its implementation. U.S. interference is the main obstacle in the way of implementation of the Guatemala agreements.

At the same time, Nicaragua showed a responsible attitude to its commitments and is prepared to continue meeting them. The Sandinist government put forward specific ceasefire proposals which boil down to the surrender of arms by the contra gangs. Only after that the Nicaraguan Government is prepared to discuss the forms and ways according to which those who lay down arms will be able to embark on peaceful life, and their leaders to participate in political activities. Yet the answers of the contras are in the spirit of the toughest statements by representatives of the Reagan administration, Ramirez said. The contra leaders said themselves that their proposals had been coordinated with the U.S. State Department.

Yet despite all efforts, peace is not yet a real fact in Nicaragua. For almost a decade now we have defended the gains of the Sandinist Revolution. If the imperialist aggression goes on the people of Nicaragua are prepared to carry on the struggle, Ramirez emphasized.

Political & Social

Sakharov Calls for Afghanistan Pullout

PM141429 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 49, 6 Dec 87 p 2

["Letter to the Editor" by Academician Andrey Sakharov: "The Breakthrough Must Be Continued And Widened"— boldface as published]

[Text] The agreement on medium- and shorter-range missiles is an event of tremendous political, military and psychological importance that diminishes the nuclear threat hovering over humankind. The two sides have agreed to have really effective mutual control. All of this is a sign of new thinking. It is extremely important that the breakthrough that has been achieved should be continued and widened.

I believe that the next step should be an agreement on a 50-per-cent reduction of the strategic nuclear forces — missiles and other intercontinental means of delivery. This agreement, I am convinced, can be reached **irrespective** of the problems of antimissile defence and any other political and military problems. My conviction in this respect is based on what has been universally recognized by all experts as low efficiency and vulnerability of SDI in the foreseeable future. The 50-per-cent reduction of intercontinental nuclear forces under any conditions will not upset the strategic balance in the world, but, coupled with the agreement on medium- and shorter-range missiles, will provide a totally new psychological and political atmosphere for the further advance towards a safer and more equitable world, for the solution of regional conflicts in an atmosphere of greater trust, and for further nuclear disarmament. More through-going nuclear disarmament (by more than 50-per-cent) is predicated after a mutually acceptable solution of the problem of limiting antimissile defence and research of new military technology in conditions of mutual control, equilibrium and reduction of conventional armaments, political and military measures conducive to mutual security and confidence (such as, for example, the creation of fully demilitarized corridors in Europe and other regions), and greater openness in society.

In application to the USSR the following, I believe, brooks no delay: 1) elimination of a seat of mistrust in a vast region, discontinuation of the suffering of the Afghan people and of the death of Soviet soldiers, the swift withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan; 2) the unconditional release and **rehabilitation** of all those condemned for their convictions and non-violent actions connected with these convictions (at the beginning of this year 200 persons were released, as far as I know, but not rehabilitated). This would be instrumental in bringing about international trust.

In the foreseeable future I consider it possible and necessary for the USSR to implement a bold step - to unilaterally reduce the term of service in the army, navy and air force with a simultaneous reduction of every type of armament.

The funds released in the world, notably in the USSR, thanks to disarmament, will make it possible to solve pressing social, economic and ecological problems nationally and internationally.

For the USSR, disarmament, along with democracy, glasnost and the eradication of dogmatism and stagnation in very sphere of life - economic, cadre and social - constitutes a major component of perestroyka, a source of its strength.

On the general historical plane it is possible to save humankind from thermonuclear and ecological self-destruction, I believe, only through profound changes in the direction of society's openness, observance of human rights, the drawing together (convergence) of capitalist and socialist systems coupled with renunciation of biassed attitudes, dogmatism and messianism, and with real equality of all nations and races on our planet.

Zaykov Addresses Moscow Gorkom Plenum

PM111615 Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 6 Dec 87 p 1

[Unattributed report: "Moscow CPSU Gorkom Plenum"]

[Text] A Moscow CPSU Gorkom plenum was held 4 December.

It discussed the tasks of transition to the new conditions of economic management, set by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at the 4 December conference in the party Central Committee.

The plenum was addressed by L.N. Zaykov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom.

The fundamental importance of raising the standards of organizational and political work aimed at unconditional fulfillment of plan targets and socialist pledges for the current year was noted. It is literally a matter of days, and much still remains to be done.

The main point in industry is to achieve 100% fulfillment of the contractual deliveries plan. Many enterprises and entire rayons in the capital are successfully solving this task. But this is no excuse for failures elsewhere. Steady work by some collectives cannot make up for the failures and breaches of delivery discipline by others.

Questions of capital construction demand particular attention by party committees at all levels and by soviet and economic organs at the closing stage of the year. A tense situation prevails there.

The entire package of construction industry problems will be examined in the party gorkom in the immediate future. The management structure of Moscow's construction industry conveyor belt will have to be seriously examined, and measures will have to be elaborated to prevent the development of a situation whereby the bulk of newly built projects is handed over in the last few days of the year. Even so the work is done carelessly and poorly.

It is impermissible that the commissioning of schools and vocational and technical schools is still being planned for the last quarter and even for December, despite the party Central Committee's strict demand that such projects should be handed over before the start of the academic year. The Moscow Gorispolkom Planning Commission must amend the annual plans accordingly.

The time left until year's end must be utilized to the utmost benefit so as to prepare solid starting positions for the transfer to full economic accountability [khozraschet] and self-financing, the entry into force of the Law on the State Enterprise, and the expansion of the scope of state acceptance, including in the construction industry. Primary responsibility for this is, of course, borne by enterprises' economic and party leaders. In close contact with with labor collective councils, they must create an atmosphere in which every worker is clearly aware of his responsibility, his tasks, his economic role, and, finally, the benefits accruing to him from the economic reform. Work must be done in such a way as to ensure that labor collective councils gain a certain amount of experience in self-management even prior to the introduction of the Law on the Enterprise.

It is clear that these tasks cannot be solved without the involvement of management links at rayon, city, and sector level. Hence, it is the duty of party raykoms and Moscow CPSU Gorkom departments not only to monitor progress in the fulfillment of this year's plans at local level but also, jointly with the ministries, to ensure that there are no uncertainties left as regards the questions which will have to be solved from the very first days of the new year.

The party gorkom plenum has been held right after the conference in the CPSU Central Committee, which very objectively and scrupulously analyzed the state of affairs and tasks regarding the preparedness of sectors, enterprises, and organizations for transition to full economic accountability [khozraschet] and self-financing organically linked with the deepening of restructuring and the further democratization of social life.

It is very important, the conference noted, to eliminate as soon as possible any shortcomings existing in work on the introduction of the new economic mechanism.

The unstable financial position of many of Moscow's enterprises is a particular cause for serious concern. In the new conditions of economic management this may have negative consequences both economically and socially. Consequently, measures to improve enterprises' finance are now among the most important and most urgent. Here it is necessary to act strictly in conformity with the Law on the State Enterprise.

There are many reprimands made at local level as regards the placement of state orders, the conclusion of economic contracts, and the preparation of production for the fulfillment of next year's plan. For many enterprises, and especially in machine building, state orders account in full for the entire production program and at times are even in excess of production capacity. In other words, we have—just as before—a superior organization exercising its diktat when plans are drawn up. This fetters the initiative of enterprises in determining a specific products range taking consumer requirements into account.

Despite the fact that this year Gossnab local organs, ministries and departments, and associations and enterprises have had considerably more time to conclude contracts, this work is still not completed and state orders are not coordinated with the actual potential of individual enterprises and their available resources. And some soviet and party organs in the city and rayons have detached themselves from this important work.

Thorough attention must be given to the question of giving enterprises broader opportunities to apply the funds they earn to the development of production and the social sphere so as not to undermine the labor collectives' faith in the efficiency of the new economic mechanism.

The elaboration, finalization, and enhanced substantiation of economic normatives must be completed with utmost speed.

The transfer of scientific organizations to full economic accountability [khozraschet] and self-financing must become an important link in the restructuring of the economic mechanism. But numerous institutes are still unprepared for work in the new fashion. Very often, and in the guise of transferring to economic accountability [khozraschet], they retain largely the old methods of centralized financing of scientific institutions. The party gorkom and raykoms must certainly monitor these issues and assist in their swiftest solution.

The restructuring of internal economic accountability [khozraschet] is progressing only slowly in many enterprises, the transfer to collective contracts is held back, and the level of economic training remains low. The result of this is that workers are not directly informed of the demands of economic accountability [khozraschet]. The transfer to full economic accountability [khozraschet] is still not being linked to the introduction of new wage rates and salary scales to be funded from enterprises' own resources. All these questions must be immediately resolved.

The city party organization and all its cadres are now undergoing a serious test of their maturity, of their ability to work in the new fashion not in words but in deeds. Tasks involved in the introduction of the new economic mechanism and democratization must determine the content of party meetings and raykom plenums held to hear reports by committees and bureaus on their leadership of restructuring. The party Central Committee attaches great political importance to them.

Unfortunately, by no means all the meetings already held at primary party organizations have met the demands of the time. Many of them were held in the old style, formally, without producing the expected result. The Kiyevskiy Party Raykom plenum was no exception in this regard. One can only agree with the critical conclusions contained in the MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA report. Today, however, it is necessary to draw one more, perhaps main conclusion: Responsibility for this failure must also be borne by the party gorkom departments, in addition to the Kiyevskiy Raykom secretaries and Bureau members.

Restructuring is a qualitatively new process for us all; our work involves many unknown quantities. In these circumstances, local party organizations and party raykoms need comradely support, businesslike advice, and specific assistance. We are in no way talking about curbing the independence of rayon links. Comrades in rayon and primary organizations must be helped to make their reports a proper source for imparting new energy to party work in the city at a time when the entire party has embarked on preparations for the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference.

At this stage of transformations, the task of party committees is to channel the labor energy of the people, of all party links, and of all social organizations toward the solution of two key tasks: giving vitality to the fundamental economic reform and deepening the processes of democratization. Implacable struggle against conservatism, against pretended restructuring, against divergence between words and deeds—this is the main meaning of the discussion which must be conducted at party raykom plenums. It must be followed up by specific actions to expand self-management and glasnost, to develop initiative, and to ensure people's active participation in the elaboration and implementation of decisions. Much more work still remains to be done in this regard from both the organizational and the propaganda viewpoint.

New practical steps to expand glasnost are currently being taken in Moscow with the backing of the party Central Committee. The PRAVDA editorial board has suggested opening a special correspondent's office in the city for the purposes of deepening the permanent and close contacts between the editorial office and the Moscow Gorkom and providing fuller coverage of the progress of restructuring in the capital. In addition to this, a new creative subdivision has been established—a TASS editorial desk for Moscow news (MOSTASS), which will supply the press in Moscow and the entire country with effective coverage of the work experience of the capital's party committees, the problems of the transfer to the new conditions of economic management, and news from the social sphere and culture, in other words all aspects of Muscovites' life.

The city party organization has at its disposal the country's strongest ideological potential and, especially since the October jubilee events, has the richest of material for explanatory and educational work. But the utilization of this potential is still unsatisfactory. It is necessary to substantially boost ideological work both within labor collectives and at the population's places of residence. Especially in view of the fact that the content of our propaganda and agitation abounds with exceptionally important topics linked with the introduction of the Law on the Enterprise, the introduction of economic accountability [khozraschet], and the expansion of state acceptance.

To put it briefly, major work lies ahead of us all in the economic, social, and spiritual spheres, and it must be skillfully translated into specific deeds, ensuring that tangible results are produced for people at every step.

In this context, a few words about trade during the pre-New Year holiday period and other city affairs.

Monitoring, and monitoring again of the work by trade and public catering organizations; efficient and most effective monitoring. While preparing for trade fairs, the other types of trade services must not be overlooked. Reports by Muscovites are highly alarming. Either bakeries have received no bread, or there are breakdowns in milk or meat products supplies. Yet the city has been allocated significant resources. But they are not always promptly utilized through the fault of trade organizations.

Those responsible for the solution of these problems at rayon level must be called most strictly to account. No references to so-called objective reasons will be accepted as an excuse. Remiss workers hoping that demandingness, including demandingness by the law enforcement organs, may slacken are hoping in vain.

There is still too much disorganization and economic mismanagement. Take the question of street cleaning, for example. As soon as snow falls, the entire system of the Moscow Gorispolkom's Main Administration for

Road Building and Exploitation breaks down, and many of the city's streets become impassable. Yet the proper snowfalls are yet to come. Every rayon must have strictly substantiated estimates of its needs for snow-clearing equipment depending on the intensity of the fall.

All these matters of daily routine must be solved at local level, in rayispolkoms and their services. Leaders of soviets and soviet deputies must justify the voters' trust by deeds. Inertia, apathetic idleness, and self-satisfaction are incompatible with restructuring.

O.A. Korolev, secretary of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom, then delivered a report on immediate measures for the unconditional fulfillment of the state plan for Moscow's economic and social development and of socialist pledges by the city's working people in 1987.

A report on the Moscow CPSU Gorkom Bureau's work in the period between August and December 1987 by Yu.A. Belyakov, secretary of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom, was taken next.

The plenum examined organizational questions.

In connection with I.D. Pisarev's election as first deputy chairman of the Moscow Gorispolkom, the plenum relieved him of his duties as party gorkom secretary and member of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom Bureau. V.K. Belyaninov, previously working as first secretary of the Volgogradskiy party raykom, was elected secretary and member of the Bureau of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom.

The plenum appointed A.Ya. Nemtinov, working as chief of the party gorkom's Administrative Organs Department, chief of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom Party Organizational Work Department. V.V. Skitev, who previously held this office, was relieved of duties as chief of the Party Organizational Work Department in connection with a transfer to work in the Moscow Gorispolkom.

V.S. Samorodov, previously working as CPSU Central Committee instructor, was appointed chief of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom Economic Department. D.G. Chernik was relieved of duties as chief of this department in connection with his appointment as chief of the Moscow Gorispolkom Main Financial Administration.

V.F. Chernyshov, previously working as deputy chief of the department, was appointed chief of the Moscow CPSU Gorispolkom's Administrative Organs Department.

The plenum appointed V.A. Martin, previously working as first secretary of the Moskvoretskiy CPSU Gorkom, chief of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom General Department. A.N. Tsaregorodtsev was relieved of duties as chief of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom General Department in connection with transfer to other work.

N.A. Zolotarev, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee Party Organizational Work Department, took part in the plenum's work.

Shcherbitskiy Addresses Kiev Gorkom Plenum

PM141053 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Dec 87 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Being Equal to the Tasks of Restructuring"]

[Text] Kiev, 12 Dec—All organizational and political work must be equal to the level of the new tasks set by the 27th CPSU Congress and life itself. A Kiev party gorkom plenum held today made this appeal to the more than 230,000-strong detachment of Communists in the Ukrainian capital. In an atmosphere of businesslike efficiency, high principle-mindedness, criticism, and self-criticism its participants discussed a party gorkom report on the leadership of restructuring delivered by party Gorkom First Secretary K.I. Masik.

The gorkom bureau's activity in conditions of the expanding processes of democratization and glasnost and the struggle to accelerate the country's socioeconomic development was comprehensively analyzed in the report and in the speeches by I.A. Chub, milling machine operator at the V.I. Lenin "Arsenal" Plant; B.V. Soldatenko, first secretary of Leningradskiy party raykom; D.G. Topchiya, general director of the "Kiyevskiy Radiozavod" Production Association; V.G. Salnikov, first deputy chairman of the gorispolkom; A.P. Martynenko, chief of the Kiev City Main Administration for Housing and Civil Construction; Ukrainian SSR People's Artist L.G. Bakshtayev, party organization secretary at the L. Ukrainka Russian Drama Theater; and others. Emphasis was placed on the need to learn practical lessons from the experience of the first stage of restructuring, to consolidate and develop the emergent positive trends, and to implement measures for the elimination of existing shortcomings. It was said that it is necessary to persistently aim to boost the activeness of party committees and primary party organizations, and of all Communists, and to take public opinion more fully into account when solving questions affecting the working people's vital interests.

The plenum participants gave much attention to questions concerning the education, training, and placement of cadres. It is necessary to patiently help them master the new demands, to teach them to work in the conditions of the new economic mechanism, and to evaluate their activity according to the practical results achieved. There must also be greater demandingness toward leaders of all ranks as regards the observance of party and state discipline, socialist legality, and moral behavior. Anyone displaying immodesty, arrogance, and a scornful attitude toward people must be most strictly taken to task; incompetent workers must be decisively removed, and a struggle must be waged against any manifestations of bureaucratism, departmentalism in work, and regionalism.

The plenum participants said that, at the second stage of restructuring, it is necessary to display high standards of endurance and staunchness, not to give up in the face of difficulties, to act selflessly and energetically, and to ensure the unconditional fulfillment of targets for the current year and the 5-year plan as a whole.

Ye.Z. Razumov, first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee Organizational-Party Work Department, addressed the plenum participants.

The plenum was addressed by V.V. Shcherbitskiy, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee. Having set a firm course aimed at the implementation of revolutionary restructuring in all spheres of socialist society, he said, our party has taken a big responsibility on its shoulders. In the broad historical and general political context the tasks of deepening it were concretized in M.S. Gorbachev's report at the jubilee celebrations in Moscow and his speech at the meeting of party and movement representatives held afterward.

The entire cause of restructuring and the shaping of the new political thinking has been given a new impetus—in both the theoretical and the practical respects. The results of the third Soviet-U.S. summit in recent years have been the first real result of the assertion of new approaches in the international arena, the result of our peace offensive against the threat of thermonuclear war.

The conclusion of the treaty on the elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles has become an event of historic significance because this treaty meets the cherished hopes and aspirations of all peoples. It has not only made a start on nuclear disarmament, it is not only changing the strategic situation in Europe, but it has also become a real step toward the examination of other vitally important international problems, including those linked with the improvement of Soviet-U.S. relations.

Like all Soviet people, the people of the Ukraine have reacted to the Soviet-U.S. talks with profound satisfaction and will do everything possible to increase their contribution to strengthening our socialist state's might.

As throughout the party, preparations for the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference have begun in the republic party organization. Party committee plenums and Communists' meetings at which reports from elected organs on their work in leading restructuring are now being discussed constitute an integral part of our preparations. This most important political campaign shows that in the republic the activeness of Communists and all working people is increasing and their aspiration to successfully resolve tasks whose complexity and crucialness are growing immeasurably at the new stage of restructuring is intensifying.

If we assess the course of these reports as a whole, they indisputably testify that changes in the necessary direction, and first and foremost in the matter of democratization, radical economic reform, and work with cadres, are obvious and gathering momentum.

According to the preliminary data, the main national economic targets for the first 2 years of the 5-year plan will be fulfilled. The rates of growth achieved in industrial production and labor produictivity are higher than planned. The targets for the extraction of coal and iron and manganese ore and the production of finished rolled metal, coke, mineral fertilizers, and many types of consumer goods are being overfulfilled. The gross grain crop this year exceeded 50 million tonnes, which is 7 million tonnes more than last year. More grain, meat, milk, and other types of agricultural produce than planned have been purchased.

The social program is also being successfully implemented. More housing, hospitals and health centers, and cultural and consumer service facilities than envisaged by the 5-year plan are being commissioned.

At the same time many processes, particularly during the transition to the new conditions of economic management, are finding the going difficult and proceeding unevenly in different fields and different places. Arrears in contractual deliveries of output are increasing, and output quality is rising only slowly.

All this testifies that changes for the better are slow in coming and the necessary breakthrough right across the board has still not happened. It is the duty of party and Soviet organs and economic services to find out what is happening, who and what is retarding these processes, and take off the brakes.

V.S. Shcherbitskiy went on to dwell on the situation in the Kiev city party organization. He stressed that changes for the better are taking place in the style and methods of the gorkom bureau's work but there are still many unresolved tasks in the matter of restructuring. What has been done far from matches the possibilities, the tremendous potential, and the tasks facing the city party organization.

The party gorkom does not always have sufficient ability to single out the main thing and work out in depth the ways to resolve the urgent tasks. There is sometimes a lack of persistence and purposefulness in pursuing the objectives which have been set. Success has still not been achieved in raising all the city's party committees and primary party organizations and many labor collectives to the level required by restructuring.

New thinking, a new mentality, and new methods and approaches are needed to resolve the complex tasks of the second stage of restructuring, whose essence consists of implementing in practice everything that has been planned. It is perfectly clear that the success of the matter will depend primarily on the dynamism of the restructuring of party work itself.

Today the CPSU Central Committee is orienting us toward a definite change in the functions of party committees and the increasingly complete assertion of political methods of leadership. Under the conditions of the further democratization of the life of society it is necessary to learn to resolve complex task not by issuing commands and supplanting soviet and economic organs but by developing and channeling the activeness of the masses and organizing and coordinating their efforts through party organizations and cadres.

Yet it is precisely in work with cadres that there are considerable defects and shortcomings in the Kiev city party organizations; the perspective which is so necessary here is absent. There is no real reserve for the leadership of many crucial sectors. So when there is a need for cadre changes a feverish search for candidates often begins. The cadre reserve is often formed without being discussed in party organizations. All this testifies that the gorkom bureau and primarily the gorkom secretaries responsible for this important matter, K.I. Masik and S.M. Martynyuk, and also bureau member A.S. Yakovenko are in no hurry to break with old, unproven approaches in cadre work.

The party gorkom bureau must embark more boldly on the broadening of democracy and glasnost in cadre work and make better use of the city party organization's potential. The training of cadres must also be handled better.

V.V. Shcherbitskiy noted that a number of enterprises which switched to full economic accountability and self-financing at the beginning of the year have recorded worse economic performance indicators.

There are several reasons for this. But one of the main ones lies in the fact that nobody took care in time to train team leaders, foremen, and shop chiefs in the fundamentals of economic accountability relationships or improve their economic training. This is still being repeated now, when a further large group of enterprises is switching to economic methods of management. The party gorkom and raykoms have essentially failed to monitor how the middle echelon, workers, and trade union organizations of enterprises are preparing for this transition.

There has been a great deal of talk about new forms of work in the gorkom recently. This is good; it is necessary to seek new ways and experiment. But this must not be turned into an end in itself, into a campaign. One must also not forget the tested forms of work which have confirmed their viability. Everything must work to benefit the cause and achieve results.

But what often happens in practice? As you know, the party gorkom bureau has recently heard reports from a number of gorkom secretaries and department chiefs, the gorispolkom chairman, and all his deputies. If you judge their work by city newspaper reports on gorkom bureau sessions you get the impression that all of them are manifestly failing to cope with the matters entrusted to them, that they have all recorded total failures. People quite naturally ask: Why then have they been left in their posts?

This kind of approach hardly helps the cause. Accountability reports and constructive criticism are necessary. But they must necessarily be followed by concrete actions to eliminate the shortcomings noted, about which people must be extensively informed.

The first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee went on to dwell on questions relating to the socioeconomic development of the republic's capital. It was noted, in particular, that Kiev, a major scientific center, has slipped back and to some extent lost its reputation in the matter of accelerating scientific and technical progress. The proportion of output in the top quality category has even declined recently, first and foremost at enterprises in Darnitskiy, Moskovskiy, and some other rayons. In Kiev, which has such a powerful scientific and production base, not a single tape recorder, color television, or radio receiver has been certified as being in the top quality category.

The problem of reducing manual labor also remains acute. The proportion of such labor at industrial enterprises and in construction is declining extremely slowly. At the same time the "Labor" program's targets for reducing the number of manual workers are regularly not fulfilled. Work on job certification and rationalization is also underrated. In the Glavkiyevgorstroy [Kiev Gorispolkom Main Administration for Housing and Civil Construction], for example, only one-third of jobs have been certified.

Sometimes the gorkom bureau does not analyze the reasons for the situation in depth and when eliminating shortcomings places more reliance on administrative and voluntarist methods and various conferences and meetings. But what is needed is resolute action and specific organizational work in labor collectives.

As of January 1988, V.V. Shcherbitskiy stressed, more than one-third of the republic's enterprises, producing 55% of industrial output, will be operating in conditions of full economic accountability and self-financing. The party gorkom bureau, all party organizations, soviet and economic organs, and, of course, enterprise leaders first and foremost must analyze time and again enterprises' readiness for work in the new conditions.

Particular attention must be devoted to the shaping of economic normatives and state orders, the conclusion of contracts for the supply of output, the transition to the new conditions of labor remuneration, the introduction of intraplant economic accountability, and the improvement of enterprises' financial position. It is particularly important at this time to display concern for the creation of a healthy and creative atmosphere in labor collectives.

The party gorkom bureau and gorispolkom must be systematic and more persistent in resolving tasks linked with improving the conditions of Kiev citizens' life, labor, and everyday existence. Because today there are serious complaints about the situation in the social sphere in the city.

This applies primarily to housing construction and the state of the housing stock and the strengthening of repair and construction organizations' facilities. Year after year the city economy is poorly prepared for the winter.

The prime culprit in the situation which has developed is the gorispolkom. Its leadership uses old yardsticks, and no real aspiration to get out the rut can be seen. Many years ago the gorispolkom reserved for itself the solution of the most important questions of the city's life. But now, when Kiev has grown considerably, the city services are manifestly not coping with this.

Party gorkom bureau member and gorispolkom chairman V.A. Zgurskiy, who needs to radically change the style of both his own work and that of the gorispolkom, has a particularly great deal to answer for with respect to all these shortcomings.

Under the conditions of the further development of democracy and the broadening of glasnost, when persuasion is becoming the main method, the role of ideological and mass political work is increasing considerably. Today it must be aimed primarily at shaping a political ethos in people, at underpinning the radical economic reform with a solid foundation of democratization.

As is known, the interest of the public, and particularly of young people, in questions of culture and our history has now intensified. Our academics, writers, and figures active in the arts are submitting a considerable number of ideas and proposals for the development of the city's spiritual life and the organization of worhtwhile leisure. This is good. It is also necessary to rely on this activeness.

However Gorkom Secretary V.I. Mikhailovskiy and the party gorkom's ideologiocal departments do not always keep up with events and Kiev citizens' growing requirements. For example, a republic government resolution on the creation of an "Ancient Kiev" protected historical and cultural zone has been adopted taking the public's wishes into account. The implementation of what is contemplated could be backed up by the efforts of the city's inhabitants. But this is not being done. But interest in Kiev and its unique monuments is growing particularly in connection with the upcoming 1,000th anniversary of the introduction of Christianity in Rus.

It is also necessary to take account of the fact that often culturological [kulturolgichekiy] problems also become the target of political speculation. There must not be an unprincipled attitude to instances when some comrades, including party members, use glasnost and the development of democracy as a pretext for misrepresenting and tendentiously and sensationalistically interpreting individual historical facts without making any constructive proposals here. A wait-and-see attitude is intolerable in ideological questions, especially during a turning-point period. Communists and primarily leaders must defend the party line in a well argued and convincing manner and resolutely combat any attempts to utilize the processes of democratization and glasnost for purposes far removed from the tasks of restructuring.

The main role in implementing the tasks of the socio-economic and cultural development of the republic's capital belongs to the Communists and all the city's working people, of course. Therefore it is very important for work to be substantially intensified, implacability toward shortcomings increased, and tangible changes for the better resolutely sought at every level—from the party gorkom bureau to the primary organization.

The attention paid to advanced experience should be intensified, and everything of value that emerges in the course of restructuring must be garnered literally grain by grain and brought into play.

Live, daily work in primary party organizations and labor collectives must become the main element in every party worker's activity. The main thing here is to rectify, advise, and support, not just look for shortcomings. Today, when the practical implementation of everything that has been planned is coming to the fore, the organizational role of the party and every Communist is assuming decisive significance.

Volyn Obkom Bureau Scored at Plenum

PM141205 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 12 Dec 87 p 2

[Report by correspondent S. Luzgan under the rubric "Party Life: Facets of Restructuring": "Act More Vigorously, in the Spirit of the Times, Is What Was Urged by the Participants in the Volyn Ukrainian Communist Party Obkom Plenum Which Discussed the Bureau Report on the Leadership of Restructuring"]

[Text] Ukrainian SSR—Both in the preparation for and during this plenum, which for the first time collectively analyzed the party obkom bureau's activity there was much that was unusual and unwonted. In order to study public opinion more fully, the oblast newspaper RADYANSKA VOLYN published a request from the obkom bureau to the oblast's Communists and working people and the theses of the report. Meetings took place between obkom secretaries and obkom members and candidate members, party veterans, Communists, the elected aktiv of the soviets, trade union, Komsomol, and people's control, and with workers of the administrative organs. Party committee members were polled. The theses of the bureau report were discussed in many primary party organizations. Over 300 proposals and comments came in which were used in preparing the definitive version of the report.

Delivering the report, L.I. Pavlenko, first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Obkom, comprehensively analyzed the activity of the obkom bureau and its secretaries in restructuring organizational-party and ideological educational work. The plenum participants were unanimous in their assessment of the bureau's work. They noted that so far restructuring is being carried out at an inadequate pace, without proper dynamism.

The party obkom secretaries heard impartial criticism levelled against them at the plenum. For instance, serious complaints were levelled against S.A. Kupriyanov for omissions in the work of the construction organizations of which he is in charge. In particular it was noted that, although he visits the labor collectives, the effectiveness of these visits is still slight and no attention is paid to the work of the party grassroots.

The plenum participants drew the attention of obkom secretary I.M. Sementsov, in charge of the agro-industrial complex, to the marked lag of the processing industry capacities, which is delaying the development of the oblast's entire agrarian sector. Instead of influencing production with forms and methods appropriate to the party committee, the secretary often tries to usurp the leaders and specialists of the oblast agroprom.

Party second secretary V.I. Blazhenchuk also had to hear reasoned criticism levelled against him. There is still no clear-cut demarcation between the party obkom departments regarding the sphere of the application of their efforts. Verification of execution is only feebly established. The following examples were cited. Of 348 critical remarks made at the last oblast party conference, half have still not been acted on. This year the party gorkoms and raykoms received 298 documents of various kinds. These are mainly obkom plenum, bureau, and secretariat resolutions. Some 40 bureau sessions adopted 747 resolutions. B.I. Zabrovarnyy, first secretary of the Lotsk party gorkom, in particular, stressed that the activity of the obkom bureau must be assessed primarily not by the number of decisions taken but by how it influences the rayon, city, and party committees. So far this influence cannot be felt much.

Speaking of the work of Obkom First Secretary L.I. Pavlenko, elected to the post 5 months ago, the plenum participants noted that in this relatively brief period Leonid Ivanovich has been able to study the situation in the oblast party organization and, by relying on its healthy forces, has introduced much that is new and out of the ordinary to the bureau's work. This was confirmed in his speech by V.G. Fedorov, member of the obkom bureau and chairman of the oblispolkom. He noted that much has improved in the bureau's work style. There is more collegiality and exactingness. Whereas only recently the main efforts of the bureau members went on investigating various conflicts, frequently artificially created, today their attention is focused on specific deeds and specific problems of restructuring.

On behalf of all bureau members the first secretary stated:

"We can clearly see that the desired changes have failed to occur on individual sectors. Shortcomings in economic and social development and in organizational and educational activity are a serious omission in the style of work of the bureau and of the secretaries and apparatus of the obkom as a whole.

"This talk of party-style directness and exactingness was in my opinion predetermined by many preceding events in the oblast party organization's life. To put it bluntly, for a long time it had no luck with its first leaders. On each occasion a leading worker of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee recommended a candidate for the post of first secretary. Trusting the authority of the higher-ranking organ, the obkom members automatically voted for the recommended candidate. A certain amount of time would elapse and the party leader thus elected would rise above all the obkom members and even above his bureau and gradually acquire a veneer of bronze [bronzovel] as they say and feel himself to be outside control, outside criticism. The time would come and we would be obliged to remove him from his post. But once again he would be removed following an order from above. Here is what is characteristic: None of those who recommended him would bear responsibility for the candidate who had turned out badly.

"Some 5 months ago Z.S. Kovalchuk and V.I. Zhibrov, respectively first and second secretaries of the Volyn Obkom, received strict party sanctions and were relieved of their posts for serious shortcomings in their work—violations of collegiality, blunders in cadres policy, and even deviation from socialist legality. Obkom Secretary I.M. Sementsov and Ye.I. Kurlchuk, member of the obkom bureau and chairman of the oblast agroprom, were penalized for serious shortcomings. Obkom department chiefs I.V. Pustyulte, A.I. Stupakov, and A.M. Voytsekhovskiy and P.S. Melnichuk, chairman of the obkom party control commission, were relieved of their posts."

The serious disruptions in the work of the obkom have also had an adverse effect on the activity of the rayon echelon. Several party raykom secretaries who have compromised themselves have received strict party penalities and have been relieved of their posts. The report and speeches voiced the same opinion: The appropriate conclusions must be drawn from the errors of the past to ensure that yesterday's pernicious practice is not repeated today. There are now new people in the obkom bureau. They are called on to rid themselves of the chronic disease which has persisted for many years and to open up broad scope for the activation and mobilization of those party forces which are rethinking party work not verbally but in deeds to ensure that its style and methods fully accord with the tasks of restructuring.

The oblast has acquired a markedly more rapid momentum recently. For instance, this year the biggest grain harvest in the entire history of the Volyn area has been harvested and the plans for the production and sale of the main produce of fields and stock units have been fulfilled and overfulfilled. There are marked improvements in the development of industry and in the social sphere. These good changes, the plenum stressed, must be not only consolidated but also developed. On this basis a fundamental breakthrough must be achieved in the oblast's socioeconomic development.

Life persuades us that the success of restructuring depends primarily on how far the party organizations are able to put into operation and to activate the human factor and its creative potential and to ensure in practice the Communists' vanguard role. The activation of the work of the primary party organizations and the enhancement of the role of every party member in the collective and through him of every worker—that is the range of fundamental questions which the plenum participants put foremost. The plenum noted that the party committees and primary organizations are now always the creators of public opinion and the moral and psychological mood in the labor collectives. Obsolete forms and methods of ideological work incompatible with the atmosphere of glasnost and democracy have not been completely eliminated. Some party workers avoid open discussions on crucial issues and fail to pay proper attention to individual work with people.

Moreover ideological and mass political work does not always consider the fact that gangs of Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists used to operate in the Volyn area as they did in other Western oblasts of the republic. The atheistic education of working people is badly organized in the oblast and new socialist rights are being instilled only feebly. For many years the ideological sector was headed by Obkom Secretary Ye.A. Polivanov. Subjected to serious criticism at the plenum and failing to find within himself the strength to restructuring the sector of party work in his charge, he has applied for retirement, as they say. The plenum satisfied his request to be relieved of his duties as member of the bureau and secretary of the obkom.

The plenum discussed with great concern the grave errors and blunders in cadres policy. In the past 7 years the chairmen of 279 of the oblast's 341 kolkhozes have been replaced.

"Today it must be said frankly," N.P. Ostapets, first secretary of the Manevichskiy party Raykom, said in his speech, "that the party obkom is still allowing serious shortcomings in the selection, placement, and education of cadres. There are instances of support for workers who have failed and who have abused their official position and of their protection from criticism.

The Volyn Ukrainian Communist Party Obkom plenum passed in a businesslike, frank atmosphere. Having analyzed comprehensively and in depth the style and methods of party leadership of restructuring, the plenum participants demanded that its new bureau remove more rapidly all obstacles from the path of renewal and skillfully put the levers of acceleration in motion.

Udmurt Leaders Scored for Law, Order Work

PM091035 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Dec 87 Second Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "At the CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee. On Serious Shortcomings in the Activity of Communist Leaders of Udmurt ASSR Law-Enforcement Organs in Fulfilling the CPSU Central Committee Resolution of 20 November 1986 'On Further Strengthening Socialist Legality and Law and Order and Increasing the Protection of Citizens' Rights and Legitimate Interests'"]

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee has examined the results of a check on the fulfillment in the Udmurt ASSR of the CPSU Central Committee resolution of 20 November 1986 "On Further Strengthening Socialist Legality and Law and Order and Increasing the Protection of Citizens' Rights and Legitimate Interests" and adopted a corresponding decision on this question. It points out that the leaders of the autonomous republic's law-enforcement organs and CPSU members—Comrade V.M. Pokhodin, prosecutor; Comrade A.N. Mineyev, deputy minister of internal affairs; Comrade A.M. Shikhov, minister of justice; and Comrade I.M. Karpov, chairman of the Supreme Court—have taken an irresponsible attitude to the fulfillment of the said CPSU Central Committee resolution, tolerated serious shortcomings and violations in the work of the departments that they head, failed to display high exactingness toward cadres for the irreproachable execution of their official duty, and taken a passive stand in implementing restructuring in the assigned sectors.

As a result, work on ensuring strict observance of socialist legality and the strengthening of law and order has still not been widely developed in the autonomous republic, as demanded by the CPSU Central Committee. It is frequently carried out in a disorganized manner, to a low professional standard, without relying on the broad public and without the necessary glasnost.

The efforts of prosecutor's office workers are not properly concentrated on precise observance of the laws in the work of ministries and departments, local soviets, and leaders of enterprises and organizations, kolkhozes and sovkhozes. Checks that are conducted on the execution of the laws on the safekeeping of socialist property do not always produce the desired results. Official and economic crime continue to affect state and cooperative trade most of all, where in 1986 alone deficiencies, thefts, and losses arising from product spoilage totaled R3.2 million, as well as enterprises of the agro-industrial complex, where losses doubled last year and exceeded R10 million. Little attention is paid to eradicating figure padding and deceit, and an assertive struggle is not waged against unearned income.

Prosecutor's office establishments carry out unsatisfactory supervision of examination and investigation, as a result of which numerous instances of the groundless detention of citizens and of criminal proceedings being instituted against them and the substandard investigation of criminal cases continue to occur. Whereas 11.6% of cases were examined in violation of the established deadlines in 1985, this year the figure is 16%. Investigative organs complete one case in every eight in violation of the law's demands. The number of cases referred by people's courts for additional investigation has almost doubled compared with 1985.

There has been no fundamental restructuring in the work of MVD services and subdivisions—which has had an adverse effect on the state of socialist legality and law and order. Thefts of citizens' private property have recently become more frequent in the autonomous republic, and the number of rapes has increased. There are more manifestations of hooliganism in a number of rayons. Almost one offender in every three is arrested in a state of intoxication. The passiveness of militia organs has been one cause of the growth in recidivist crime, which stands at 24% this year.

The situation is particularly bad in the cities of Izhevsk and Sarapul and in Kiyasovskiy, Syumsinskiy, and certain other rayons, where an atmosphere of complacency has developed and where leaders of administrative organs are not called strictly to account for the strengthening of law and order.

City rayon internal affairs organs continue to cover up crimes and keep them off the record, and crime detect[illegible] is at a low level. In 1987 criminals who have committed 1,645 indictable offenses have remained unexposed.

The ASSR Ministry of Justice and Supreme Court superficially examine the work of people's courts, are failing to enhance their role in the struggle against offenses, and are directing their activities in an unsatisfactory way in terms of eliminating the causes which allow mercenary and other criminal manifestations to develop. The correct application of laws is not ensured in courts. For these reasons people's court sentences with regard to 128 citizens have recently been disaffirmed or changed. Supreme Court court collegiums permit substandard examination of cases.

Shortcomings in work with law-enforcement organ cadres are being eradicated only slowly. One employee in every four has been dismissed from the militia organs over the past 3 and 1/2 years, and more than half of them were dismissed for negative reasons. Almost all criminal investigation workers and more than half the specialists in the investigative apparatus of city rayon internal affairs organs were replaced during the same period. Disciplinary proceedings were instituted against 33 prosecutor's office and investigation workers for various violations and misdemeanors.

The Udmurt CPSU Obkom and the ASSR Council of Ministers do not carry out daily organizational and political work to fulfill the CPSU Central Committee resolution of 20 November 1986, do not display exactingness toward law-enforcement organs for the enhancement of their operating efficiency, and do not direct the attention of party gorkoms and raykoms and local soviets toward giving them practical assistance in intensifying the struggle against crime and eradicating all deviations from the law which infringe citizens' rights. The CPSU obkom and the ASSR Council of Ministers have taken a formal approach to discussion of the CPSU Central Committee resolution and failed to monitor its fulfillment.

This work has been carried out to a low standard in many party gorkoms and raykoms and in the primary party organizations of law-enforcement organs, where a clear-cut action program to strengthen law and order and further increase guarantees of citizens' rights also has not been drawn up.

Comrade V.M. Pokhodin, Udmurt ASSR prosecutor, has been reprimanded for serious shortcomings in work on fulfilling the CPSU Central Committee resolution, for failing to take proper measures to strengthen socialist legality and law and order in the republic, and for weakening prosecutor's office supervision of examination and investigation.

A similar measure has been taken against Comrade A.N. Mineyev, Udmurt ASSR deputy minister of internal affairs, for unsatisfactory organization of work on fulfilling the CPSU Central Committee resolution, for allowing the services under his jurisdiction to work at a low standard in terms of the timely exposure and detection of crimes, for relaxing the struggle against recidivist crime, and for failing to take proper measures to improve the quality of investigation and to retain cadres.

Comrade A.M. Shikhov, minister of justice, and Comrade I.M. Karpov, chairman of the Supreme Court, have been severely reprimanded for shortcomings committed in fulfilling the CPSU Central Committee resolution of 20 November 1986, for unsatisfactory leadership of people's courts, and for serious omissions in court activity to eliminate the causes which enable mercenary and other criminal manifestations to develop.

The CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee reprimanded Comrade Yu.P. Kudyashev, chairman of the Udmurt ASSR Council of Ministers, for indiscipline manifested in organizing the fulfillment of party and government decisions on further strengthening socialist legality and law and order and increasing protection of citizens' rights and for lack of control exercised in this.

The attention of Comrade N.I. Smirnova, secretary of the Udmurt party obkom, was drawn to the low standard of organizational work on fulfilling the CPSU Central Committee resolution "On Further Strengthening Socialist Legality and Law and Order and Increasing the Protection of Citizens' Rights and Legitimate Interests" and to the lack of proper exactingness toward party gorkoms and raykoms for improving the political leadership of law-enforcement organs and organizing effective control over their work.

The committee took account of statements by the aforesaid leaders that they will take measures to eliminate the shortcomings exposed by the check and to fundamentally improve work on strengthening socialist legality and law and order in the republic and ensuring reliable protection of citizens' constitutional rights and legitimate interests.

Saratov Officials Jailed for Bribe-Taking

PM141508 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Dec 87 Second Edition p 6

[PRAVDA correspondent A. Vorotnikov report under the rubric "From the Courtroom": "Bribes for the Plan"]

[Text] Saratov, 7 Dec—As is well known, there is much building going on in the countryside now. Naturally, any construction project begins with the plan. It is only a question of when it will be received: There is a waiting line at the design organizations.

"It could be speeded up," kolkhoz chairmen and sovkhoz directors were given to understand by L. Kryuchkova, leader of the Saratov Design and Estimate Group at the Chernomorkurortproyekt Institute, and V. Gnidenko, chief of the Saratov Architectural Design Shop at the Stavropol branch of the Rosproyekt Institute.

The bargaining began. Having received bribes from the farm leaders, Kryuchkova and Gnidenko rapidly drew up design documentation for various agricultural rpojects. Then, through Yu. Kireyev, deputy chief of department at the Saratov Oblast office of the USSR Gosbank, the documentation was submitted for financing.

So it went on for several years. In that time Kryuchkova received bribes from farm leaders totaling more than R7,000, Gnidenko—more than R4,000, and Kireyev R5,000.

The Volzhskiy People's Court in Saratov City cut short the criminal activity of these newly fledged schemers. Kryuchkova was sentenced to 8 years, Gnidenko and Kireyev to 6 years' imprisonment, all with confiscation of property.

'Civic Stance,' Exposure of Abuses Needed

PM081611 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Dec 87 Second Edition p 1

[Ivan Podsvirov article under the rubric "Frank Discussion": "Stance or Ambition?"]

[Text] It is not for nothing that the restructuring now under way in the country is described as the continuation of the cause of Great October. It really is similar to our revolution in terms of the depth and scope of the socioeconomic and social transformations planned and already being implemented, in terms of the openness in discussing urgent problems and topics which at one time were considered "prohibited." We Soviet people are now involved in everything. We all, from worker to minister, are held responsible for the success of restructuring.

It has become the norm in the conditions of glasnost and democracy to criticize bureaucrats, cheats, and idlers for everyone to hear and without being afraid of the consequences, in other words to expose economic mismanagement, connivance, and other negative phenomena. The party relies on the working people's principledness, creative initiative, and activeness. Everything we have decided upon must be implemented, decisions must always be followed up by actions.

A civic stance gains its strength primarily from the sincere desire to overcome shortcomings and jointly change life for the better. Only by relying on public opinion will it be possible to establish discipline and organization in every collective and at every work place. A great role in this has to be played by party members.

"A Communist must always pursue a firm line of behavior and must struggle against lack of principledness," Z. Balashova, a worker at the Uralsk Standardization and Metrology Center, writes to PRAVDA. "You must, however, be aware that you may ruin your health and create problems for yourself. But the struggle is struggle. Once you have joined in, don't whimper. If you are convinced that you are right, pursue your goal!"

These are not empty words. The letter writer fought a protracted and real battle against a defective style of leadership, drunkenness, and official abuses in her collective. Instead of a strict appraisal of the facts, Balashova herself was subjected to systematic persecution. Initially she received adverse performance reports, later on she was debarred from performing any social functions. Finally, and altogether groundlessly, Zoya Petrovna was accused of accountancy and financial forgery and of... hooliganism, and was expelled from the CPSU.

It would seem that the worst had befallen her. But Balashova did not falter. She did not lose faith in the correctness of the work she had started. On the contrary, she continued her struggle against shortcomings. And justice triumphed. The Sverdlovsk CPSU Obkom Bureau ordered the Sverdlovsk Party Gorkom to investigate the situation in detail. Balashova's stance was firmly backed. Center Director L. Ignatyev was dismissed from office and Party Bureau Secretary K. Yuryev was expelled from the party. They did not get away with persecution for criticism.

"This proved to me yet again," Z. Balashova writes, "that people like Ignatyev, Yuryev, and their patrons are yesterday's men. If they do not understand today's demands and fail to restructure themselves, life will reject them."

As we can see, a Communist's stance is dictated by major state interests and vital concern for the success of the common cause. Readers' letters arriving daily in the editorial office testify that the majority of Soviet people are just as consistent and staunch in implementing the party's plans. With their shock labor and implacability toward shortcomings they express their firm stance—to be in the front ranks of restructuring.

Even so, though, notes of pessimism are often to be detected in the mail. "I found myself like a white crow among a flock of kites," N. Chalyy writes from Ulyanovsk. "I criticized, and nobody backed me. So why did I fight and why am I still fighting? I have been passed over for promotion and for housing...." Reading this, you automatically recall Z. Balashova's advice: "Once you have joined in the struggle, don't whimper!" If you are secretly dreaming of achieving some personal gains through your activeness, or wish to "fix" someone out of rancor, what sort of a "bold stance" is this?

Downright demagogues are often to be found among the "fighters for truth." An engineer from Saratov comes to the editorial office and, without pausing for breath, starts criticizing "totally useless local customs." He lists negative instances he has read about in the newspaper. "Just imagine, they dug a hole in front of my home. They have not filled it in for 2 years now. Disgraceful!" I asked the comrade: What has he personally done for the elimination of shortcomings? Why could he, together with his neighbors, not fill in the hole in question? "It is not up to me," he replied. "I am reporting it to you, now do something about it!"

There can be no argument that fair criticism, even when it is most biting, is necessary and useful. But there must be greater circumspection when assessing critical statements.

Is a principled stance at times not replaced by camouflaged lies and petty bourgeois malicious glee? Or open discussion by striving to assert oneself at the expense of glasnost or to settle accounts with incompatible workers? These are not simple questions.... They must be borne in mind. Especially now, when elected organs are reporting back to party organizations in an atmosphere of broad glasnost and tasks for the future are being defined.

The supplanting of criteria and terms elaborated in the process of renewal is very harmful and consequently impermissible. But things like this do happen, unfortunately. For example, on the initiative of the Alekseyevskiy mixed feed plant leadership, the collective's meeting embarked on a discussion about reelecting the shop chief; an important event, or so it would seem; in the spirit of glasnost.

People discussed all aspects of the work of Shop Chief L. Menshikova. But when it came to taking a vote, Director B. Volkov said: Let us bide our time. The workers were indignant: Why bother them then, why stage an election show? It appeared that the director had simply decided to teach the "disobedient" social figure and rural soviet deputy a lesson. Let her see, he thought, who is more powerful. It seems that Kuybyshev Oblast's Kinel Party Gorkom ought to properly evaluate this incident....

What we need are an honest approach toward the work in hand and honest words without any perfidious intent. Only their combination determines a truly civic stance.

Problems in Forming Plant Councils Discussed

PM081451 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 1 Dec 87 p 2

[Candidate of Philosophical Sciences A. Simakov article under the rubric "Restructuring of the Economy: The Law on the Enterprise": "'Collective Director'"]

[Text] The tumbledown roof in the workshop, supply, the results of competition and the subbotnik—these and dozens more very varied questions are being discussed today by labor collective councils, whose numbers are growing daily. What is this—a wish to encompass themselves all the acute problems of life within the plant? A desire to analyze and assess them "from below"? Or perhaps the members of some councils simply do not know where to apply their efforts? In order for labor collective councils to operate competently and usefully, it is necessary to clearly define their tasks and to grasp why production needs this new management organ today.

"Councils are being and will be created in enterprises whenever it is impossible to get by without them and it is impossible to manage production efficiently," Nikolay Ilich Travkin, organizer and inspirer of the economic councils, loves to repeat. They were the prototype for labor collective councils, whose status has been defined by the Law on the Enterprise. How can we fail to concur with such a standpoint!

Since the publication of the draft Law on the Enterprise, councils have begun to be actively created in many labor collectives. Is this because workers everywhere simultaneously realized for themselves the need for them? Alas... Many enterprises began to hastily elect councils after the relevant directives appeared from the sectorial ministries.

The reader is entitled to wonder whether this is such a bad thing. Ultimately what difference does it make if the initiative comes "from below" or "from above" when the matter is essentially necessary and useful. There is a difference! If only because the conditions which bring the new self-management organ into being directly affect its character, its powers, and its real and potential capabilities.

Let us recall how the idea of economic councils arose in Glavmosoblstroy [Main Administration for Construction in Moscow Oblast] trusts. The construction trust switched to the collective contract and a whole series of managerial questions immediately arose which the administration was unable to solve in the new conditions. Is the wages normative valid—for that is what ensures the fusion of personal and common interests? How can a reduction in labor-intensiveness really be secured without detriment to the worker? How can the work of all associated subdivisions be monitored? How can the trust leaders' coefficient of labor input be determined? Now, under contract conditions, the administration is not capable of resolving by its own will these and a multitude of other tasks which affect the material interest of every man and of the collective as a whole. In short, economic conditions themselves demanded the creation of a self-management organ. They also precisely indicated its field of activity—distribution relations.

They began with wages and gradually extended their influence to planning, supply, and cadre policy. But these questions too were only considered from the angle of the contract—has unity of personal and public interest been ensured? The more deeply economic accountability [khozyaystvennyy raschet] infiltrated the work of construction workers, the more vigorous the councils became. Economic accountability itself showed it what to tackle and how.

Let us now turn to the experience of the Moscow "Frezer" plant, where we recently conducted sociological research. There people told me that the discussion and approval of the "Plant Veteran" badge was one of the most important actions. They also talked with pride about how the council dispatched its courier to the neighboring plant to "root out" components in short supply. But, excuse me, why did the labor collective council have to tackle these matters? For in the first case this is the concern of the trade union committee, and in the second that of the supply department... Labor collective council members reacted uncomprehendingly to our doubts and even took umbrage: "What do you think we ought to do?" This happened because when the new self-management organ was created in the plant there were no real conditions for its participation in production management. Thus they had to "invent" a plan of measures which did not have the slightest bearing on this, the main task.

Remember the notorious standing production conferences. They sprang up during the 1965 economic reform and were originally a kind of proving ground for testing out its ideas. But the reform "never got off the ground," yet the standing production conferences were legalized and given official status, and for 20 years they have dragged out a miserable existence, above all because the economic mechanism worked fine without them. Under conditions of rigid administrative management, any collective organ is at best a consultant with the right to a consultative vote. This truth, which not everyone has learned, was reaffirmed by the experience of creating labor collective councils in certain enterprises.

It has to be admitted that it was difficult for us all to realize the fundamental features of the new organ. It is no coincidence that the draft Law on the Enterprise invested labor collective councils with the modest right to "examine questions." The burden of former ideas and the experience of administration by decree prevailed in the economy. The correct and productive formula was adopted only after the debate and study of the same economic councils' practical achievements: "The labor collective council... resolves questions of improving the enterprise's management and organizational structure and ensures that workers' labor remuneration is in line with their personal contribution and that social benefits are distributed fairly; it adopts decisions on the utilization of the production development, science and technology, material incentives, and social development funds..."

The labor collective council can perform all these functions, as a "package," so to speak, only in conditions of profound economic accountability. But the question is: What about the collectives as yet unaffected by the changes? For the transition to new management conditions will be implemented gradually. Is it a case of waiting with arms folded until economic accountability infiltrates all production links? No, of course not. Especially as the basic provisions for the restructuring of economic management recommend the election of labor collective councils in all enterprises this year and next year. However, in embarking on elections, we must do our utmost to avoid the mistakes we have been discussing. It is not only pointless but harmful to duplicate them. First of all, the councils must be created not at the behest of the "upper echelons," but on the initiative of collectives. These collectives must themselves be "ripe" for economic accountability and feel the need for it. This is a sphere where party and trade union organizations can show their mettle and really get down to propagandizing and introducing contract relations. It is their direct duty to channel the newborn labor collective councils in the right direction and ensure that they tackle their business.

It is necessary, in my opinion, to begin with feasible tasks. It seems to me that the main one is the election of economic leaders. It is the councils which must prepare and organize them. This will indeed be their real contribution to democratizing management. Thus the labor collective council will immediately secure the support of a democratically elected administration and will be a real pillar of that administration in the struggle for economic restructuring. The workers will see in practice that the council is not merely another formal superstructure but a spokesman for their interests. Elections are only the first step, and others will, of course, follow in their wake. Labor collective councils' influence will gradually encompass a whole range of "economically accountable" problems, as economic councils in Travkin's trust managed to do.

It is alarming that many councils are not dealing with their own business today. Something else is no less alarming: Some councils are being created contrary to the democratic tenets of the Law on the Enterprise.

I view with perplexity the disputes around the composition of the councils, and there are many of them today. Must they include primarily workers? Do economic leaders have the right to chair them? Must the representation of all social and demographic groups be ensured? Never mind the disputes, councils are being created at some enterprises according to a prearranged pattern—such and such a percentage of workers, such and such a percentage of women, and an ordinary worker at the head at all costs... This is absurd and compromises the very idea!

The collective must not be curbed by any formal restrictions in electing the council. Except, of course, for one proviso: All production subdivisions must be represented in the self-management organ so that their material interests are not encroached upon. Expediency alone determines all the remaining proportions, including the question of the labor collective council leader. The plant director or trust manager can head it, he has the authority—and anyhow, he holds all the cards. The formal preferment of a worker over an engineer or a shop chief is no more than primitive playing at democracy. Please tell me, can a labor collective council really have a serious influence on production when, out of 49 members, it only has 2 workshop chiefs, 1 deputy, and 1 foreman? Of course not. Such a council will be forced to abandon serious production tasks by virtue of its own marginal competence. That is why the experience of economic councils, where engineering and technical cadres, team leaders, and foremen are broadly represented along with workers, is instructive. Indeed, the fact that they are headed by enterprise leaders in no way lessens their importance as democratic organs. The brilliant results of the work of the "Mosoblselstroy" trusts is the best confirmation of this.

A "collective director"—this is how Travkin defined the essence of the new management organ. It is difficult not to agree with him. Under the new conditions of economic activity, only such labor collective councils can be strategists and at the same time implement the party's economic policy.

Hundreds Fight North Caucasus Pipeline Fire

PM141325 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 11 Dec 87 First Edition p 6

[N. Gusarov report: "Accidents. What Happened On the Underground Line"]

[Text] Although December was not far off, the ground in Stavropol had not frozen and repair workers from the North Caucasus Petroleum Products Main Pipelines Administration continued to tackle their usual business. That day a team of nine was to have replaced the pipeline insulation on the 281st kilometer of the Groznyy-Armavir underground line.

They unearthed a 200-meter length of pipe, attached it to a crane, and began to hoist its sections so that the workers could reach it. There was some excessive movement and the pipeline snapped. A stream of diesel fuel, which was being pumped down the line, gushed into the trench at tremendous pressure. Some stone or sliver of metal struck the pipe, caused a spark, and there was an explosion. Hundreds of tonnes of ignited fuel began to fill the pit...

As soon as the Stavropol Krayispolkom Internal Affairs Administration received word of the fire, several units and subunits of firefighters were immediately mustered. The personnel from the Nevinnomyssk support facility for extinguishing large fires and firefighters from Pyatigorsk, Mineralnyye Vody, and Georgiyevsk immediately drove out to the scene of the accident. A State Automobile Inspection Highway Patrol Service specialized squad, a separate company of the same designation from Nevinnomyssk, and the entire Andropovskiy Rayon Department of Internal Affairs were sent out to help them.

When Colonel V. Polosmak, who was directly in charge of the fire-extinguishing operation and deputy chief of the Kray Internal Affairs Administration, arrived at the pipeline, a terrible scene greeted him. Flames were raging over an area of almost 500 square meters. Fuel was continuing to flow into the trench and there was a real threat of spillage from the pit. One scarcely dares to think about what might have happened next—20 meters from the seat of the fire there was a high-pressure gas pipeline, a little further away, a highway, and beyond that houses and a clear, fast-flowing river. In addition it was, in practical terms, impossible to approach the trench from the windward side, where a the strong wind was, albeit only slightly, blowing the flames away and attenuating the heat. The point was that it was there that the soil from the trench had been thrown and there was a high steep heap there.

...The explosion occurred at 0920 and by 1000 hours the fire fighting team had organized active work. V. Potikhonin, a 36-year old insulation worker, was injured at the time of the explosion. At the hospital where he was taken urgently it was determined that 40% of his body suffered burns.. The doctors did everything they could and saved his life.

Viktor Ivanovich Polosmak organized a whole complex of protective measures. While 9 fire trucks were beating back the flames—by that time they had already managed to seal off the fuel line—powerful equipment was heaping up a dike so as not to permit the burning liquid to overflow. Militiamen quickly evacuated the repair workers who had been cut off by the fire and also evacuated local inhabitants who were in the vicinity.

They quickly dug a huge pit near the scene of the fire, a sort of storage facility for collecting the diesel fuel that had leaked out. Almost 100 men were occupied in the fire fighting and even more people performed this operation. A real battle was under way and V. Kristalinskiy, chief of the Kray Fire Prevention Administration, led the urgent operations and coordinated the efforts of hundreds of men.

It is impossible to enumerate all those who distinguished themselves in eliminating the fire, but we must nonetheless name a few names: These are Lieutenant Colonel G. Shatalov, Lieutenant A. Mikheyev, and Sergeants V. Dmitriyenko, G. Serdyukov, and A. Kalinnikov. Thanks to the bravery of the firefighters the fire was put out by 1330 hours. The competent organs began an investigation of the causes and circumstances of the accident. Fortunately there were no casualties this time...

The author of this article has frequently been at the scene of accidents and disasters recently and has frequently talked about them in this newspaper. He has often had to hear questions following his articles such as: What is happening and why are there so many accidents? I must say that they are not increasing in number, we have simply begun to talk about them more in the press. Contrary to idle comment, we are of the opinion that the more we talk about catastrophes in the press the less they will occur in life.

The first conclusions have already been drawn from the accident at the pipeline. But we are waiting to see what the RSFSR State Committee for the Supply of Petroleum Products North Caucasus Petroleum Products Main Pipelines Administration's labor collective will say.

Briefs

Satellite TV in Pamirs

A new Ekran space communications system relay allows Rushan Rayon in the Pamirs to receive two central television programs starting today. Currently there are 95 space communications stations in the Orbita, Moskva, and Ekran systems in the Pamirs, as well as hundreds of kilometers of radio relay lines, ensuring good reception of two central television programs on 90% of the Pamirs territory. By the end of the year, two more major rayons of the Gorno-Badakhshan Autonomous Oblast are to get space links to Moscow. [Summary] [*Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 14 Dec 87 LD*]

Belorussian Magazine

The first issue of the political-social and literary-artistic magazine KRYNITSA was published today. It is an organ of the Belorussian Komsomol Central Committee and the Belorussian Writers' Union. The magazine is published in Russian and Belorussian. [Summary] [*Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 14 Dec 87 LD*]

Economic

Aganbegyan Answers Questions on Restructuring

LD151825 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1600 GMT 11 Dec 87

[Talk with Academician Abel Gezevich Aganbegyan, member of the USSR Academy of Sciences Presidium, on the "Thinking About the Vital Aspects" program presented by Svetlana Alekseyevna Zhiltsova, RSFSR 'artiste,' in the Ostankino concert studio on 26 October; Aganbegyan answers questions from unidentified members of the audience—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Zhiltsova] Greetings. Today, esteemed comrades, we are to have a meeting with a scientist whose thoughts and feelings are directed toward solving the economic problems of our society. The Human Factor, complete financial autonomy, socialist enterprise,—now these concepts are familiar to everyone, they have simply entered our everyday consciousness. But 15 to 20 years ago Academician Abel Gezevich Aganbegyan, member of the USSR Academy of Sciences Presidium, the well-known Soviet economist who now heads the USSR Academy of Sciences Economics Department, had to stand up and defend them. Over to you.

[Aganbegyan] Thank you. I must say that this is the first time I have appeared in such a role and I hope it is the last. I think we have not gathered here for me to give a lecture or some sort of introductory remarks. I think that we should start straight ahead with questions, with some sort of conversation. I hope that it will be a sufficiently confiding conversation. So, who will ask a question?

[Zhiltsova] Comrades, please get your questions ready in verbal or written form. So, to start with, who is going to be first? Who is the bravest and boldest?

[Unidentified man] I am a student in the journalism faculty, [name indistinct] of the journalism faculty at Moscow State University. I have two questions for you.

One of them is rather abstract. It concerns history. The second is a bit more specific. First, with regard to the failure of all of our economic transformations, perhaps not all of them, but in principle, in the fifties and sixties, I am interested in the reasons for these failures and the differences, as you see them, and the economic and social reasons. In the sense of social reasons, I am not interested in the political will of individual leaders but the consciousness of the people as a whole, that is what is called, on the whole, the subjective factor, and the link between the social reasons with Stalin's personality cult.

[Aganbegyan] Yes, serious questions, but what is to be done? You know, these questions do not catch unawares scientists who are working in the sphere of economics because our economic institutes have very deeply analyzed the course of economic transformation during the fifties and sixties and even earlier because we need to draw lessons from the past. What are the reasons? What major shortcomings, as we see them today, were committed there that we would like to avoid?

There are two reasons. The first reason is that these reforms were just partial ones. They affected individual spheres of the economy. They did not affect the economic system as a whole. Let us take as an example a period which is rather nearer to us, 1965, so that I can come to grips with the question. There were virtually no changes in the investment policy. It continued to be directed toward new construction. There were no changes in the policy on science and technology. The centralized system of material and technical supply continued to be predominant. That is the main bulwark of the administrative method of management. On the whole, the system of administrative directives and targets remained the main one. What was changed? There were changes in th eeconomic conditions for only the lowest rung of economic management. So these were partial measures from the view point of the economy. But it is much more important—and you have correctly raised the question of the interaction of the social and economic sphere—it is much more important that these transformations although they took place in two sectors of the economy, in industry and agriculture, they did not touch upon transforming the entire society, the superstructure.

Nothing was changed in the political superstructure, in the juridical, legal, or ideological sphere such as could have backed up and developed this economic restructuring. That is the first reason. Now, we are acting differently from that period in that we are carrying out the restructuring of our entire society, the entire economy, of all spheres and not of just one individual sphere. Therefore, our measures are much more integrated, deeper, and more global. That is the first lesson that we have drawn: that partial measures do not lead to success. If the whole organism is not changed then the old organism tears away the new one or assimilates some sort of new form. That is what happened then.

Now the second question, which is perhaps a more important one. It is that the economic reforms are carried out from above, at the initiative of central organizations and organs. But subsequently, they must be backed up by broad democratization. It is necessary for the broad masses of the workers to be drawn into this restructuring movement and for them to consider it as their own. This change-over, and I am talking about the economy here, to economic democracy, to self-management, to raising the role of the collective, to making people familiar with management, all this is extremely important in order to give impetus to all these transformations because the main motive force is, of course, the workers themselves. These democratization measures that were applicable to these transformations in the economy were not employed in the period of the fifties, or the sixties. No stake was made on democratization. The main difference of the present period lies in the fact that it is precisely in democratization that we see, if you like, the main source of restructuring, its motive force, the guarantee of the irreversibility of these measures both in the sphere of the restructuring of the economy and in the broader sense.

There is democratization already now not only in the sense of economic democracy but also in the sense of political democratization, within the Communist Party. You, of course, have noticed that the agenda of the coming all-union party conference which is to be held at the end of June next year includes two questions. One of these questions is the results and tasks of restructuring our society and the second question is about the development of democratization both in society and in the party.

Going on to the connection between these social reasons and Stalin's personality cult, it would seem that there is some sort of connection. I think that the fact that we did not go in for a broad democratization at that time could be to some extent a result of some sort of echo from the cult. But to tell the truth, I am not very well versed in that sphere.

[Unidentified man] My second question is more specific. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev has said quite often and—I would say—quite confidently that as a result of all of our transformations there should be no drop in the people's living standards nor in the level of their social security. In connection with this, firstly, how do we intend to avoid unemployment resulting from raising the efficiency of our production and releasing part of the work force, people, in large numbers apparently.

[Aganbegyan] You know, the point is this: a certain stereotype is being formed among a section of the people. It must be said that one confronts this particularly when visiting Western countries. According to the stereotype, restructuring is one thing while people and their lives are something else. This restructuring in some way goes on without people, and demands from these people more work. From some people it possibly even demands sacrifices for the sake of some sort of benefits at some unspecified time and in some unspecified place.

I think that there is nothing more mistaken than such a splitting off of economic restructuring from the people's living standards and so on. In fact, restructuring of the economy is being carried out precisely in order to solve social tasks. The main reason for restructuring...[changes thought] Just look at the founding, historic documents such as, for example, the report delivered by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev at the April plenum and at the congress, and you will see that man is placed in the center of restructuring. The main direction of restructuring is the strengthening of the social orientation of our development. This means progress in solving social problems—the housing problem, the food problem, the health problem, education, the saturation of the market with goods, and so on. So this is the main field for restructuring.

Some people think of restructuring as the course of technical reconstruction, intensification, structural changes, restructuring of the central management organs, but the main effort of restructuring—if you simply look at resources—in general, in economics you do not need to just believe words, you need to look where the money is going. Just take the budget: What proportion of the budget or capital investments, say, this is a more general category embracing not just budget resources, and look where they have gone. For the first time in a vast number of years—I personally do not remember any similar time—40% of all capital investments has gone into the social sphere.

It is clear where we are allocating money and we want to receive advantages and fruits from restructuring for people not sometime in the future in the year 2000 but literally in the very nearest future during the next 2-3 years. Certain positive changes have been achieved here. I could talk about them specially but perhaps there will be a question that I will need to reply to. Of course, there has not yet been any radical turnaround. It has not yet been felt by everyone. The threshold of visibility has not yet been exceeded in the improvement of certain aspects of social life. But restructuring is for people and therefore it is even laughable to say that restructuring will lead to a lowering of living standards. If so, it would not be restructuring but something quite opposite and fallacious because the main aim of this restructuring is precisely to raise the standard of living.

Well, how do we intend to avoid unemployment? It must be said that in the forecasts for our country up to the year 2000 a very specific situation lies ahead with regard to the work force. This lies in the fact that we have now entered the period of the demographic consequences of the war. Now reaching working age are the children of parents who were born during the war. During the war, the birth rate declined steeply and therefore these parents have few children and therefore there is now a lower number of young people reaching working age. On the other hand, those who did not fight in the war and consequently did not die in the war are now beginning to reach retirement age. So a strange process is taking place: The population is continuing to grow but its central section, the working population, is growing at a much lower rate than the population as a whole. The population is growing mainly through the number of people under 16 and the number of elderly people.

But on the whole in the period to the year 2000, in the next 15 years, we will have 20 million fewer members of the working population compared with the previous 15 years. Therefore, in our country the main danger now is the increase in the shortage. A shortage of workers is a terrible thing. It usually gives rise to excessive labor turnover, a weakening of discipline, and so on. We need, first of all, to double, to at least double, the rate of increase in labor productivity in order, first of all, to compensate for this reduction in the growth of resources.

Of course, at the same time this will be primarily from manual labor. At present, 45% and some 50% of all workers and collective farmers are engaged in manual labor. By the year 2000, the target is to achieve a figure of 15 to 20%. That is, tens of millions of people should be taken out of manual labor, of course, not out of creative labor. So, there will be people released. But we need to increase staff in education in connection with children starting school at 6 and we are splitting classes to make them smaller. There has been a 30% increase in health service workers' pay. There is to be an increase in the number of daycare centers in connection with the fact that within the next few years we want to fully satisfy people's demand for daycare in all regions of the country. In the housing and communal amenity sector, we will be increasing the number of jobs as we are expanding the volume of housing construction by 50% and that means they will need the corresponding services. Our services sphere is completely undeveloped and millions of people are needed there. There is also the public food services sphere. So, the number of jobs is vast. We must now apply ourselves to improving labor productivity.

Of course, this does not mean that all of this will be done mechanically, that people will pick themselves up and move over. People must be retrained. Many people will have to be resettled into new jobs. Our country is vast. We have regions with a labor shortage where such a question would make people laugh. But there are other regions with a sufficiency of labor, as we could provisionally call them. Primarily these are the regions of Central Asia and Azerbaijan where a special policy must be conducted to create jobs, to transfer there branches of various enterprises, and to process raw material more deeply. The state is conducting such a policy.

In any event, it seems to me, during restructuring we must not give up a single one of the achievements of socialism which we arrived at with such hard work. We must continue to be a country without unemployment. It is a terrible scourge. We do not realize this so acutely. [passage omitted on unemployment in the FRG]

We must also remain the country with the lowest rents. We must certainly continue to enjoy our advantages in the sphere of free medical care, education, and other things. In general, our people must be, as people living under socialism, socially protected, and we must strengthen this social protection of people.

[Unidentified man] What measures will be taken to compensate for the proposed food price increases?

[Aganbegyan] One must say straight out that no decision on raising or some sort of lowering of prices has been made. A decision has been made to carry out price reform. A reform of all prices—wholesale prices, tariffs, purchase prices for agricultural products, and retail prices. You see, the price system is a unified system and during this reform, we want to establish a united, interconnected, well-founded system of prices, including, during this reform, retail prices as these are a very important and inalienable part of the entire price system. But what shape this reform of retail prices will take—whether there will be price increases or price reductions—this will be in 1990, the date this reform is planned for.

This is a question that is being studied and elaborated primarily, of course, in the prices committee, a special body that exists. Economists from our institute have been brought in to take part in these elaborations. But these studies have not yet been discussed anywhere and no decision has been made on them. Discussions are taking place in the newspapers and in other auditoria. Many writers, including economists, express their opinion and some of them express the opinion that the price of bread, meat products, and dairy products should be increased.

On what basis do these people express such an opinion? There are quite weighty justifications for this. These goods are sold at prices considerably lower than their costs. For example, the average shop price for a kilogram of meat is R1.80 in state shops and the subsidy on this kilogram is R3. The subsidy on a liter of milk is 30 kopecks. The total volume of subsidies for the meat and dairy groups of products alone in 1986 was R57 billion. For comparison let me note that the state budget for 1986 was R430 billion, so you can see the scale.

This low price for these products leads to their being used wastefully as will every low price. When something is valued at below its worth this never leads to anything good. A mass of unpleasant social consequences arise: speculation and so on. There is a vast difference in prices. Prices in cooperative outlets for meat products are double and in the kolkhoz markets they are almost treble, 2.5 to 3 times higher, and this is generally so.

Now some people think that this subsidy of R57 billion goes to those who are less well provided for. All right, so it's bad, there are shortages, lines, a lack of choice, and so on, but at the same time by this means we provide well for those who live poorly. That is what some people think. But this is not so. Quite a thorough study of this issue has been carried out and it shows that state meat and milk is consumed more by the well-off who have higher pay. The subsidies mainly go not to those poorly off but to the medium and well-off. That is, on the social level this is also unjust. From the territorial point of view, this is also unfair. The Economics Department, among others, gets quite understandable letters asking why it is forbidden in our oblast to sell meat at state prices in the shops--and there are quite a few of these oblasts because the state decided that there was hardly enough for public food services. But in other places you can go into shops and buy various meat products at the low price.

Therefore, this is a complicated question and I would like to say that there are grounds for raising prices.

Now the question arises: If prices are raised, how will this be done? With regard to this, with regard to how the reform of retail prices will be carried out, the June Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee gave two very clear directives. The first directive: that the reform of retail prices should be carried out in the most democratic way possible. What does this mean? It means that the situation cannot arise that you wake up tomorrow and see new prices. That is how it might have been in the past. Now that is not possible. Now, a draft will be published showing how these prices will be changed and what sort of compensation there will be if there are price increases. It will be discussed for several months. The decision will be made only according to the results of this discussion. That is, by the most democratic way possible. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev spoke about this yet again during his visit to Murmansk Oblast.

However, although this is a well-known fact, there are rumors going around. Some say when we get up tomorrow the rent will have changed. There are no grounds for this. If there is to be a change in rents, it will be publicized in advance. There is another rumor that when we get up the day after tomorrow there will be new pensions. This will not happen either. Before any decision on pensions is made, a draft of this law must, of course, be published, as is fitting for a democratic society. Even more is being rumored about retail prices. Some people say that there will be a monetary reform. But this is simply not even being prepared and it is quite impossible to imagine it from the economic point of view under normal economic conditions to carry out some sort of exchange of money and so on. This takes place under extraordinary conditions as there were after the war. So there are no such unexpected events in store for people.

Now, the second aspect: How will this be compensated? I have said that no decision has been made on increases. Opinions have not yet solidified. Some are for, others are against. Various opinions are being expressed. Therefore, there are of course no decisions that have been confirmed by anyone about what sort of compensation there will be. I can tell you about just one of the possible methods of compensation from our history. You may remember that bread pay increases were introduced. Well, as far as memory goes, perhaps you have seen it in books—I see that the people here are relatively young and you are hardly likely to remember how this was done. At the time, bread cards were abolished and bread prices were raised and so-called bread pay increases were introduced. So, one of the mechanisms could be the introduction of meat and dairy pay increases. It will be calculated what extra expenses will arise for the population when buying meat and dairy products at the higher prices. For example, calculated per head of the population, this will be an extra R15 per month.

So, if I have three people in the family, depending on my pay I go to get my pay which this month is a bit higher as I have not been off sick, but next month I'm off sick and it is a bit less; perhaps it's a bonus month and it's a bit more or it's piece-work or so on. But regardless of how many days I have worked or whether or not I have received a bonus, I get my pay and in a separate department sign for R45 per month in compensation for the price rise on meat and dairy products. This compensation must be done extremely honestly. All the calculations must be presented. It must be clear what sort of compensation this is. This compensation must without fail be in full. We must not at all carry out price increases at the expense of incomes, that is by lowering incomes. We can do this. With this form of compensation, the average standard of living will not fall because everything will be compensated. But the standard of living of individual strata of the population will rise. There will be a rise in the living standards of those strata of the population that have consumed a smaller amount of meat and dairy products compared with the average norm at state prices.

Therefore, the thesis of the June plenum from the directive I mentioned, the second directive, reads: The reform of retail prices should be carried out in such a way that the population's standard of living should not fall but should rise for certain strata. The question arises how this can be done. I have told you one of the possible mechanisms of how this can be done. But it is not certain that this will be adopted. Perhaps some other will be. It is possible that as a result of the discussion, opinion will prevail that we should manage without it no matter how difficult it is, because we have all become accustomed to such low prices, we have become accustomed to the shortages, we have become accustomed to the fact that at such prices there can be no price difference for different types of meat—expensive meat should differ by a factor of ten from cheap meat as is shown by the markets in other countries—but let us see what happens. I think that this is not the last time we will meet, perhaps not in this auditorium but perhaps in other auditoria and we can discuss all of this.

[Unidentified man] Thank you for your reply.

[Zhiltsova] Abel Gezevich. On the subject of prices, I have the following question. There is a lot of talk about the state giving subsidies for meat and dairy products, but there are many articles whose cost is much less than the price paid by the population. These include automobiles and televisions—I say this without any special knowledge here—blouses, boots, and they cost the state a lot less than we pay for them. What about this on the subject of subsidies? Could this not be called subsidies from the population?

[Aganbegyan] [passage omitted: the state gets all its money from the population one way or another. Artificially low prices are harmful] Why do we have such relatively high prices for automobiles? The reason is clear: Because we produce automobiles in volumes of at least 4 to 6 times less than we need to sell if we were to sell these automobiles at normal prices close to costs plus profit. Therefore, we would have to greatly develop our automobile production. But for such a vast country we produce a tiny number of cars: 1.2 million, while other countries produce almost 6-10 million; but that is another question. Therefore, in order to prevent speculative tendencies and to have, if not a balanced market, then at least a market without too much of a shortage, we, naturally, for such rare articles, take a surplus price. The nature of this turnover tax is quite evident.

[Unidentified woman] [Name Indistinct], candidate of economics of the Moscow Institute of Economics and Statistics. Abel Gezevich, in an interview published in IZVESTIYA, in a discussion of the reform of the sixties, you cite the example of gasoline distribution. Do you really think that funded supply gives rise to shortages? And what in your opinion are, in general, the ways to overcome shortages?

[Aganbegyan] This is a fundamental question. With regard to the problem of shortages, unfortunately, we did not use that word at all in our old textbook on political economy and there was no such economic terminology. However, this is a very important economic and even socio-economic manifestation. It requires professional research. The outstanding Hungarian economist Janos Kornai published a very thick book on the theme of the economics of shortage and we are now intending to publish it in our country. Of course, it is not undisputed but it gives rise to thought and attracts attention. It is a major problem, indeed. What are shortages connected with? In general, if one explains it in general terms by the gap between production and the satisfaction of social requirements, the gap between production and consumer demand, then shortages occur where there is diktat by the producer. This connection between production and social requirements is mediated by the economic mechanism. The economic mechanism in the final analysis separates these inseparable things, the system of management and the economic mechanism. In the final analysis, it is within them that one must seek the source of the shortages.

At present there are various types of shortages. Indeed, shortages are to a large extent caused by the centralized system of distribution. That is one of the factors in shortages. [passage omitted describing mechanism of shortages in terms of the distribution of sugar]

But apart from that, shortages are caused by incorrect pricing. In our country the price of fuel oil in many regions is lower than the price of coal. In our country, the price of fuel oil is several times lower than the world price. Therefore, in our country it is advantageous for people to burn fuel oil in boiler houses and even in power stations. Therefore, this price naturally gives rise to a shortage of fuel oil. If our price for fuel oil was similar to that in the United States—the United States uses only one quarter of the amount of fuel oil that we do while its overall consumption of oil products is 50% greater—then our consumption would be lower. [passage omitted: this causes shortages in the USSR, as with meat and dairy products] Thus, price is the second source.

The third major source of shortages is simply the gap between production and consumption, if production is working just for itself and is making something that the consumers do not need; but is not making what the consumer wants. So there are lots of things that people need but that we do not produce, or produce in small quantities; hence the shortage. But more are produced of other things. As I wrote in OGONEK or perhaps in IZVESTIYA, we produce 4.5 times more tractors than the United States. Why? We produce a quarter less land husbandry products; so why do we need so many tractors? Do we intend to use them all? We produce only a quarter of the amount of tractor-drawn and tractor-driven equipment. So we knowingly condemn this tractor to not working fully. It is advantageous for the tractor industry to produce so many tractors. It has long been divorced from the needs of agriculture. Sovkhozes and kolkhozes do not have to pay for the tractors; they are acquired with state money. The state grants credits. The kolkhozes and sovkhozes do not pay back credits used to buy equipment. Thus, an artificial demand has been created and artificial production. The prices at which other agricultural equipment is sold to kolkhozes is below cost. So why not take it at a low cost, at the expense of the state?

This is an extremely dangerous thing, all these methods that separate the producer from the consumer, all sorts of barriers, various unnecessary intermediate organizations, intermediaries that cannot be bypassed. Now, during the economic reform which is being conducted here, we want to put an end to this. This is the main problem. I think that the most fundamental result of the economic reform will be the elimination of shortages and making the producer subordinate to consumer demand. It is a result that will yield a vast leap in efficiency. What is efficiency in the socialist economy? It is the fuller satisfaction of demand.

If there is a shortage, then this demand is wittingly not fully satisfied. So this really is a key question. Therefore, one cannot get rid of shortages at a stroke and say: Buy what you like! Well, here all those who make it to the lines as quickly as possible will instantly buy the fuel oil. [chuckles] Where do we go from here? There must be a balanced system here; the channels of surplus money must be eliminated, like non-refundable credit and some other. There must be a correct pricing system, there must be wholesale trade, but at the same time centralized supply must be maintained where there is a deformed structure, where there are shortages for production reasons. This structure should be given money, it should be changed, it should be adapted to demand, and it should also gradually transfer to wholesale trade. So there will evidently be this phased elimination of shortages. In general, this seems to me to be corner stone and the most complex matter in the radical reform of management.

[Zhiltsova] Yes please.

[Budarina] Budarina, Olga Alekseyevna. I am a regional journalist. I have the two following questions: Forgive me, but once again they're about prices. We talk about the high cost price of milk and meat, but can it not be lowered, not by state subsidies, but by investments in the development of livestock rearing? After all, it's no secret that for as long as our milkmaids carry milk cans themselves and our farms are built so they freeze through with hoar-frost an inch thick, we will have neither cheap milk nor cheap meat. That's the first question. Of course, not being an economist, maybe I have grasped something wrongly here.

[Aganbegyan] In your question there was a contradiction that is used quite frequently: It consists of the fact that you do not consider additional investments as outlay. You understand, you say: Let's invest large capital investment into livestock rearing, let's lighten the workload of milk maids, let's automate, then the outlay will come down. Yes, current outlay will come down, but capital outlay will appear, and prices are determined not just by current outlay, but naturally, by total outlay. When I cited the figures on subsidies, then the subsidy—three rubles per kilogram of meat, let's say, on average—included not only, say, current outlay, but namely total outlay. There is a number of economic formulae for this, as to the cost price are added specific capital investments and so on. If one is to talk more fundamentally, then of course there are opportunities for reducing outlay on the production of meat and milk products, and great ones at that, and we are introducing an economic mechanism into agriculture that promotes a reduction in cost price. It must be said that in 1986 and 1987, perhaps for the first time, cost price did not rise in our agriculture but began to drop, and this process must be kept up by every means possible, and so on. I think the new prices that will be established in the course of the price reform must also be effective means for lowering outlay. They must not be so-called hothouse prices that cover all manner of bad management.

[Budarina] And my second question: We say that any science develops successfully, and one of the criteria for this success is its link to practice. How is the link with practice now being implemented in our economy, that is, specifically, what can you already say today about the experience of enterprises in transferring to financial autonomy, self-financing, and so on?

[Aganbegyan] That's a fundamental question for any science, and for the science of economics it's simply a question of life or death. Life or death because the organic link with life, the verification of any theoretical conclusion by practice is simply the main thing, perhaps, for an economist who wants to recommend, who wants to state some scientific theses. Our economic institutes—which have been seriously criticized namely for their isolation from life—lately, I think, have seriously turned toward real practice. This turnabout is, of course, insufficient. Of course, not everything can be done quickly. But, nevertheless, the scientific section of the governmental commission on management is attached to institutes and departments. We are keeping our finger on the pulse of restructuring, one could say. We carry out various investigations and we have roving teams and hold economic expeditions. We visit enterprises and we gather directors there, along with other economic managers. Of course, we are engaged in a serious generalization of the first steps of the self-financing and financial autonomy system. Nine months have gone by, 9 months since that moment when five branches of industry went into this. There was no experience; quotas were fixed differently for different branches. This year turned out to be a very complex year in its overall conditions; you know, in January and February industrial growth simply almost did not develop because of various reasons, and so on.

Well, these branches that have transferred to the self-financing system have on the whole worked somewhat better than other branches. But as for some sort of radical shift or leap that we would like to have from the application of the new methods of management, that, for the time being, is not to be seen. The reason for this lies not only in the fact that these branches were crushed by direct indicators [adresnyye pokazateli]. At the time there still was no law on enterprises and they transferred to a system that was fairly indeterminate. But that's not the whole point; they were indeed set individual quotas, quotas were set not very successfully in a number of branches. Enterprises that were working well, that up until then had been keeping 70% of their above-plan profit according to past conditions, and that now transferred to quite strict quotas—because by individual quotas the ministry took more profit from the enterprises working well in order to subsidize the ones that were working badly—this process of redistribution got going and clipped the wings of many good collectives; I'm stating my own viewpoint here. So in this experience there is a great deal that is very contradictory and it's quite clear that we have to go further. We have to go further and we really have to transfer to economic methods; then we will get a serious result. For the time being, it seems to me from the first steps of self-financing—well, steps when the law on enterprises was not yet in force—for the time being, as it seems to me, we have not obtained the expected results.

[Desyatkina] Lidiya Konstantinovna Desyatkina, lecturer at the Ufa Petroleum Institute. So, you have said that individual quotas—well, let's say establishing wages, profit, and the distribution of profits and funds—individual quotas are bad. Indeed, our enterprises have experienced this themselves; individual quotas are bad, they are established volitionally, there are no economic methods there. You advocate—and many people in the press do so as well—single quotas. But such quotas will not conform to the requirements of social justice. How can, say, a single quota be established for deductions to the social and cultural amenities and housing construction funds, a single quota for all enterprises, well let's say by the Ministry of the Petroleum Refining and Petrochemical Industry for the entire country, if, on many types of social amenities, Bashkiria is in 51st or 59th place in the Russian Federation? That is, with equal quotas this would mean programming this situation for Bashkiria for many years. Or let's say the Urals coefficient on wages, well, the regional coefficient. After all, quotas must take it into account. The complexity of jobs, the level of harmfulness of work is different at enterprises—quota is the same. That is, equal quotas here also do not meet the requirements of social justice. What's to be done?

[Aganbegyan] Tell me, do you consider it to be socially just that we have a single system of taxes? Let's say you have two dependants, I've got three. You're ill and I'm healthy, and we pay taxes according to a single system...

[Desyatkina, interrupting] You can't say that...

[Aganbegyan interrupting]...a single scale...

[Desyatkina, interrupting]...the scale is different...

[Aganbegyan, interrupting] What do you think? Do we have to take into account the fact that I'm ill?

[Desyatkina] The scale is different...

[Aganbegyan, interrupting] It depends on my wages and not on whether I'm ill, whether I have a left arm, a right arm, whether my head...

[Desyatkina, interrupting]—but it does depend on the wages, the amortization quotas are also not unique...

[Aganbegyan, interrupting] So it just depends on the wages, and the enterprises' quotas will depend on the same thing; there'll be some sort of scale, it may depend on earning capacity or on some other factors. But to take note of what you're saying and to institute total arbitrariness, which is what you're doing under the guise of taking into account working conditions here and there—anybody can swing these quotas around as they like. Why do this? [passage omitted reiterating same point]

There must be a scale, a single scale; my point of view is that there must be a single scale. It may take into account the branch aspect, it may take into account the regional aspect, it may take into account the level of earning capacity, and so on. All this must be researched, this is being researched, let's wait and see. There are many other opportunities. Bashkiria is in 51st place. By all means, redistribute a part of the production funds, the enterprise development funds to finance social and cultural amenities. Take credits out of the bank, rectify the situation. Why must everything come from above, why must some bureacrat sit and watch: Bashkiria is in 51st place—he's going to forget this Bashkiria. If you look at the real quotas for Bashkiria, you will see that for Bashkiria, for social and cultural amenities they are no higher than for other regions, and in a number of cases they are lower.

In one rayon there two enterprises next to each other in Bashkiria. The ministry in Bashkiria has made allowances for one and not for the other, that's even worse, you understand. How is it done? After all, we're not in an empty space. We're constantly pushing at open doors, as if nobody sets these quotas. But in all countries everything is according to quotas. In any capitalist country, any enterprise pays a tax, there is some sort of amortization policy and so on. In Italy every enterprise hands over half its profit to the budget, a profit of a ruble, or a profit of a million, or a profit of a billion lire, or 10 billion lire—you've earned it, hand over half to the budget. That's the system. In some other countries there's a progressive system, in some...[changes thought] that is, it seems to me that this is indeed justice. It is unjust to differentiate, it is unjust...

[Desyatkina, interrupting] [words indistinct]

[Aganbegyan] So, for decades they did nothing, they neglected everything, they wrecked everything, instead of building housing. Others bent over backwards, restricted themselves, built, mobilized everybody, built more houses. Now, those who did nothing, are they to be given favorable quotas? There you go, social and cultural amenities; forgive me, you've worked badly, here we are giving you now—what? State funds, in effect! These are grants. And you have worked well, now you have a rest. You've built a great deal, now let's trim you and give your money to Bashkiria, who... Why is it in 51st place? Because they haven't been working.

[Desytakina] But you can't put it that way...

[Aganbegyan, interrupting] Well, they've been working badly on social and cultural amenities. Why else have they ended up in 51st place?

[Desytakina] [Words indistinct]

[Aganbegyan] You can't do it that way, do you understand? It seems to me that there should be a single law: justice. So, I have given my viewpoint. It is very dangerous; I feel that in general ministries should keep away from quotas. That is a function of centralized planning and the implementation of a single policy...

[Desyatkina, interrupting] [Words indistinct]

[Aganbegyan] Otherwise one enterprise will do one thing and another something different.

[Zhiltsova] Yes please.

[Kolodnykh] Vadim Kolodnykh, faculty of journalism at Moscow State University. Abel Gezevich, do you not think that when free competition takes place in our country, and in conditions of enterprises' commercial viability, a destruction of enterprises will also inevitably occur in our country? What will this destruction be like in our socialist reality?

[Aganbegyan] You know, comrades, one should not abuse this term free competition. You are proceeding from the fact that what we have here is a boundless market, everyone seems to be doing what they like, and so on. Indeed, this is what it may look like on the surface, but, in fact, our market—not just the present one, the present market is simply deformed and very narrow and unbalanced, but, let's say the future market that we're striving for, a market of consumer goods and means of production, a balanced market with a well-grounded pricing system—this market will not be free and uncontrolled in the extremely broad sense.

It will nevertheless be a regulated market and a restricted market. We will not be selling natural resources or enterprises; we won't have any unemployment, therefore there won't be a free market of manpower. For the time being we are not planning to sell shares and, consequently to set up a capital market, to have a stock exchange and promissory notes and so on. That is, all we will have is a commodities market, true, it will expand—there will not only be consumer goods but also means of production—but this market will be regulated, all the more so since prices on key commodities will be held in the hands of the state, and the state, through the system of economic quotas, will influence the formation of the revenue and outlay of its enterprises and associations. So, this market will not be that free, with boundless competition, as it may seem. That's my first remark.

My second remark is that, at the same time, of course, competition in this market, economic competition, as we call it as it applies to our conditions, must of course be seriously developed, and, in fact, a number of our enterprises may end up, and will certainly end up in a situation of being insolvent enterprises, of being bankrupt, let's put it that way, bankrupt. So, at the moment the number of unprofitable enterprises in the USSR, in industry, is 13%; out of this 13% the major part are unprofitable because of an unfounded pricing system. These are mainly extractive enterprises, including first of all, the coal industry, for which prices have been fixed below outlay, not because that's the world market price, or our assessment of this coal is very low in our country, we don't need it and we want to shut down these enterprises—those aren't the reasons. How this came about is a special question, but one way or another, when prices are revised, I think that the number of unprofitable enterprises will be substantially decreased, but nevertheless they will remain. At the moment the appropriate ministries are dealing with every one of these enterprises: Why are they unprofitable, what needs to be done to take them out of their stalemate?

A special readjusting economic mechanism is even being set up during the transfer to financial autonomy and self-financing for insufficiently profitable and unprofitable enterprises so that they may improve. But, nevertheless, such enterprises will exist. So, some enterprise begins to get into a difficult financial situation, it has nothing to pay the bills with, it becomes insolvent, what is to be done? How do things stand at present if an enterprise ends up in this situation? The bank usually helps it, it gives out credit. The bank at the moment is not financially autonomous, the credit it gives is state money. This enterprise, having obtained the credit, requires more credit and often does not repay this credit. The wages of the bank employees are neither higher nor lower because of this, they get the wage money from the budget. Of course, they try to return the credit, but it will be no great calamity if it isn't returned.

Right now the situation is different: Banks are being transferred to financial autonomy—that's one thing, and it's full financial autonomy. That means that the wages of the bank employees, as well as the social development fund and the material incentive fund, will depend on how the credit is returned, and with interest. Therefore, the bank will not just give our credit to an enterprise that is working badly, it will also give out this credit only with the ministry's guarantee that in the event that the enterprise does not return it, the ministry will pay this credit with interest, or under some other special conditions, possibly, or the bank will be given data that this enterprise really will get out of its problem as a result of this credit, that it will be able to earn money and return it, only in this event.

Then, apart from the bank, the ministry may help out. This enterprise may be reorganized, its specialization may be changed. This enterprise may be joined up with some association that will assimilate it and use it, this enterprise may be handed over to another branch, and so on. If the ministry's attempts are not successful, and the ministry gives up on this enterprise, then the enterprise will have to be declared insolvent by the bank, and in line with the law on the enterprise, this enterprise will be subject to liquidation. There is no more detailed law or decision on the bankruptcy of enterprises, that is, how all this will be done comprehensively. No, the law on enterprises states that the workers of this enterprise, which is to be liquidated, must be warned in good time about this liquidation. The workers must be paid 3 months' wages. Naturally, they will be placed in jobs by the state bodies, a liquidation commission will be set up, and it will sell the stock and premises of this enterprise, and with the recovered money will pay off those with whom this enterprise has incurred debts.

We are not the first socialist country to have embarked on this path; such a law on bankruptcy has been adopted in Poland, Hungary, and the People's Republic of China. But, everywhere it has been adopted and is in force it is rather the exception, that is, there are examples of bankruptcy, but namely examples, and not mass occurrences, not hundreds and thousands of enterprises, but single figures. How will things go in our country? I think they will probably go the same way. I think that the closure of an enterprise will be the exception rather than the rule, although many economists in socialist countries believe that the approach has got to be more strict. Because, what does the term unprofitable enterprise mean in a correctly fixed pricing system? An unprofitable enterprise is a robber who dips into society's pocket. Its collective, which is part of society, lives like a dependant at the expense of others, and because such an enterprise exists society develops more slowly and everybody suffers from this. This unprofitable enterprise creates circles around itself and the more we reanimate it, the worse it will be for all the others. It is decomposing, the appropriate odor is coming off it, and we're still supporting it, supporting it, and may it live! I think that a stricter system is required here, but only practice will show; as the experience of other countries shows, legislative acts alone are not enough, practice will show how we will deal with this enterprise. I think that in our specific conditions, these will be single figures, but God forbid I should be wrong!

[Kolodnykh] Thank you, I am grateful to you. [applause]

[Skripkin] Kirill Skripkin, 5th-year student at the Moscow State University Economics Faculty. At present in the press there is a mass of notions about the dynamics of prices in our economy. The spectrum is as follows: from stating that we have had no price increases at all, as the journal ARGUMENTS AND FACTS claims and ending with stating that in the 11th 5-year plan, say, we had 3%

real economic growth and the remaining 14% was generated by inflation. So, where, according to you, does the truth lie, or at least, what extremity is it closer to? Many thanks.

[Aganbegyan] With our price statistics, prices are increasing in our country, judging by the official statistical data. Over the last 10 years or so, they have risen by about 12% on foodstuffs. If one calculates it, on account of shifts in ranges, we have a hidden increase in prices in progress, and everybody can see this with the naked eye. This hidden increase in prices covers not only consumer goods, but also machines and equipment, when the features of these machines are improved by 20%, while the price trebles—such examples are legion. From the standpoint of the prospects for totally avoiding this—well, let's call it a goods range price increase, mainly in connection with the change in production quality the shift of production to a better-quality, and thereby, more expensive range—I think that we won't succeed in avoiding it, nor is it necessary, because the population's demand is changing. The important thing is that the market should be saturated, that's what's important, and it's important that there shouldn't be any unfounded price increases not in connection with the change in the consumer qualities of goods, their novelty and so on, but namely in terms of a factor of pure price. All in all, the threat of inflation always exists when you transfer to economic methods, when profit can be obtained not only through lowering prime costs or a growth in production, but also through a price increase. Therefore, a special anti-inflationary mechanism is needed, price control is needed, there must be fairly strict market pressure in order not to allow inflationary effects. This is a task that is far from trivial, and as the experience of other socialist countries shows, the majority of them or part of them have not succeeded in avoiding, well, a fairly serious annual increase in prices when transferring to economic management methods. We take this experience into account and we will be striving to set up and form this anti-inflationary mechanism when we come to it after the price reform.

[Zhiltsova] Yes please.

[Skripkin] Thank you.

[Mityayev] Dmitriy Mityayev, also a student at Moscow State University. Let's say, take self-management: an elected director of an enterprise must be confirmed by a higher body. If he is not confirmed, there's another election, and you end up with a variation on appointment from above [naznachenchestvo]. That's my question.

[Aganbegyan] You've isolated one instance: that the director will be confirmed by the ministry, but he will be confirmed by the ministry out of those the labor collective has elected. The minister cannot appoint his man behind the labor collective's back if the labor collective won't vote for him. As the experience of self- management shows in Bulgaria and in Hungary, in Hungary problems do not arise, only in exclusive cases, like the bankruptcy of enterprises, do conflicts arise where the labor collective has elected someone and the minister has not confirmed them. You understand what this means? Tomorrow this minister will start getting exposed in the press, if the collective has elected correctly; the collective will persist, will start writing letters. Why does the minister need this? All the more so since he can't appoint his man without the opinion of the labor collective, but he will strive to influence the selection of these people, he will visit the enterprise—well, not necessarily him, his people will start agitating—and that's very good and necessary. They will learn to work under conditions of self-management. I don't see any such points here, this is in no way like the old system.

[Mityayev] No, but the role of the ministry...

[Aganbegyan, interrupting] I want to quote you a well-known Marxist aphorism: power is not granted, it is seized. The laws of the USSR and its resolutions grant rights, definite and specific rights, to local bodies, enterprises, and labor collectives. Now, some bureaucrat up there, out of old bad habit ignores this and issues instructions: Produce the following! Several times I witnessed instances when the labor collective gathered and said: But we're not going to do this. This is beyond our established production capacities, this is beyond the raw materials and stock we have been issued for this, this is simply the invention of a man who has gone too far, or our ministry. Therefore, in line with the law on enterprises, we adopt the following plan. What does this bureaucrat go on to do? Does he take this labor collective to court? No, the labor collective can take him to court, as you know, or individual members of the collective, then things will go badly for him.

So, from my point of view, you have to implement on the spur of the moment those rights that are on record in the supreme resolutions, first of all the law on the enterprise, and not wait for the administrators to disarm, and that, as soon as the law is adopted, they will immediately forget about phone calls and the petty tutelage they must give up. No, they are people, they've become accustomed to working that way, they will try to continue to work that way. Many of them, in any case, will do so not out of spite, not because they're against restructuring or something else, but simply many of them don't know any other way, they've become accustomed to this, they don't know how to work in a new way. So, of course, other measures are also needed apart from taking the law into one's hands. Evidently a variety of additional legal defenses and so on are needed, but people must also do it themselves. I welcome the fact that you're fighting, but the entire labor satisfaction against a labor collective must be according to the law.

[Plotkin] Yuriy Grigoriyevich Plotkin, scientific staff member at at the USSR Academy of Sciences Water Problems Institute. I have the following question: At the moment, opportunities have arisen for broad public participation in the discussion of a whole series of major projects—I'm talking about projects in the broadest sense of the word. However, if one is to take public opinion as being decisive in the fate of a project then here we will have to deal with a situation in which a good project may be declined on the basis of erroneous public opinion. Erroneous public opinion may be formed as a result of, say, tendentious pieces in the mass information media, or simply by the population's nonacceptance of this project. Well, for example, it is difficult to expect unanimous approval for, say, urgent measures such as the price reform or the introduction, say, of charges for water. Two questions emanate from this. The first is how do you determine the range of issues of economics as well as ideology in which public discussion is expedient?

[Aganbegyan] You know, in this question we come up once again against that same problem: We have not yet genuinely tested public opinion. Well, we've discussed two projects: the diversion of the rivers and the monument to victory in Moscow. That's in terms of broad discussion. Well, there has been narrow discussion of individual ecological problems in individual regions. So we've tried it twice, and we're already afraid! We're already afraid of something. What if this public opinion is erroneous? It seems to me that we have to trust the population more. You understand, you can't put yourself in a situation in which I'm right, and everyone else isn't. You understand, our population and people right now are different. They are, after all, literate. If you also take the word public, which advocated against the diversion of the rivers, then what sort of public was it? It was to a significant extent the scientific public, professionals in the highest degree, professionals. Maybe they're not professional in how to dig a canal—although among them there were hydraulic power specialists who have been doing it all their lives, and who spoke out against—maybe they're not specialists in this, but they're specialists in, say, economics.

All the academician economists, to a man, spoke out for economic reasons against the diversion of the rivers, all members of the academy. Or if the whole Siberian Department speaks out as a whole— that is 50 institutes out of which 15 dealt with this professionally with various aspects, geological and so on—it's not as if it's the man in the street who comes up and so on. Now, if it is writers who have dealt with this, then writers are not people who simply accumulate public opinion, many of them are also specialists, specialists in definite areas. Then, you know, there is also a moral and social side to major projects that the designer simply does not see. He proceeds from an understandable principle: From point A we must get to point B. You understand? But the fact that the road from point A to point B offends someone, or there's some sort of case or something, he may not even see this in a number of cases, in other cases he may. It seems to me that, all in all, we ought to trust people more. I do not exclude the fact that at some point maybe public opinion will not be right. Convince us!

I am very fond of an expression that I think Mikhail Sergeyevich repeats tirelessly: We must learn to live and work in conditions of democracy. You are specialists, you are addressing people with a culture, convince them, convince them. Convince them—a platform is made available to all. If one is to talk about, say, water problems, those who were against the diversion of the rivers, like me, for instance, I couldn't get through to the pages of newspapers because it was forbidden to publish articles against, they had to be submitted for approval. But it was permitted to write articles in favor, and all the newspapers published almost all the time in favor. There were panegyrics all the time to this project, that it's already been adopted, that work is already in progress, and only sometimes, in the LITERNATURNAYA GAZETA, you'd pick up Perevedenets' reply or something by somebody else against. But on the whole everything was back-to-front.

So we have to learn to work, you understand. I don't think that our people are against the retail price reform. It seems to me that you simply have to convince people of this. Or people are against charges for water. Who put forward charges for water? That same public that spoke out against the diversion of rivers, and I think that that public is convinced that free wealth is a terrible thing like, for instance, water, which is taken free. The canal is built with the budget, nobody counts state money, but in effect this is, after all, real outlay. So right now everybody is in favor of water charges. The decision has already been adopted, and I haven't seen a single protest, that somebody's been protesting against water charges. Here the decision has been adopted.

[Plotkin] And the second question: Who will take upon himself the function of supreme arbitrator, so to speak, determining the fate of the project, if the opinion of the designers and the public do not coincide?

[Aganbegyan] Who is the supreme arbitrator? So, after the public has discussed the arguments cited for and against, the last word belongs to our supreme bodies. If it's a law, then it's the Supreme Soviet, if it's some sort of economic measure, then it's the Council of Ministers, and, thank God, I think right now that our leading bodies are listening very seriously to public opinion. I, for example, sat in on the sessions of supreme bodies when the fate of the diversion of rivers was being discussed, and where the decision was adopted to stop this design and construction work, to freeze it, write off the expenditure and so on. That was an appropriate decision adopted by our central organization. I think that the decision is profoundly fair, and of course it did not coincide with the opinions of those who designed it. Well, so what?

On the other hand, it coincided with the opinion of a much greater number of people. Well, what can you do here? I think that that is very symptomatic. I think we have to attract the public more. We do not need unfounded decisions, secret ones, or underhand ones.

When a group of specialists has gathered and we tell them that in effect they are specialists but they're one-sided, there's a great deal that they may not take into account. I think that major things have to be put to public discussion. At the moment they want to rebuild the center of Moscow. God forbid that this should be done as before! They'll pull down a house and then start talking. But you've first got to discuss before you pull down. We have witnessed in recent years how the public has succeeded in defending many serious monuments. I personally am for it; I don't know, you must not be afraid of discussing things with the public. I think this is an element of democratization that goes much further than a specific decision on this issue. The benefit from this is huge. So we've got to learn to work under conditions of democracy.

[Vakar] Andrey Sergeyevich Vakar, Moscow Party High School. Do you feel that it is necessary to study the role of individual social groups in the achievement of the aim of restructuring? If so, what aspects in your opinion are the priority ones?

[Aganbegyan] The social aspect of restructuring, the role of individual social groups in restructuring is a very cardinal problem, a very serious one. For me as an economist this is very important because behind every economic measure there are definite social groups, and economic and social interests. This aspect of restructuring is undoubtedly important and it must not be ruled out. In general, the transition to economic management is a transition to management through interests. Economic conditions have to be set up by means of prices, financial and credit conditions, by means of economic quotas, such that it is advantageous for the labor collective and people to do what is advantageous to the state. That is the sense of economic management and the position of various groups is extremely important here.

[Adamov] Doctor of Economic Sciences, Professor Adamov. At the moment, restructuring is in full progress, one may ascertain in the top layers of management. A number of measures have been adopted on improving the structure of central planning bodies, and so on. From the viewpoint of economic theory, what is your personal opinion: Do we have some sort of overall model for managing the national economy under today's new conditions, in which the functions of the central and territorial planning and management bodies and branch and inter-branch bodies are defined with sufficient clarity for practical purposes? And is there clarity in relation to the type of resources that are to be managed by specific management bodies? That's my first question.

[Aganbegyan] So, the second one?

[Adamov] Developing the first one: are we ready today to specify—in a fairly general form, of course—the list of those management tasks whose resolution is only within the competence of a management body at a specific level?

[Aganbegyan] So. Well, first of all thank you for the interesting questions. The questions are such that you can't say it straightforwardly. Let's say, the first question: Do we have a new economic management model ready? Yes and no. It all depends on what you mean by this ready new model. If you think that there is namely this clearly written model with all the quantitative correlations that is run through in simulation on, let's say, computers, where everything is clear and determined right through, then we do not have such a model. But we do have, of course, a definite scheme—a model scheme I would call it—with fairly, how should I put it, well scientifically grounded individual elements in the new management system. Otherwise it would be madness to transfer to a new management system not knowing what you're transferring to, and not having sufficient grounds for this. After all, every one of us understands that we can't take risks in such a large country and that the management system is a double-edged weapon. It can move the economy forward and give a real boost to development, but it can also ruin the economy, simply destroy if it this system is incorrect. If it sidetracks somewhere, it will cause anarchy, wild forces, and disproportions.

I think that the system, with a predominance of economic methods which we are transferring to and which was partially carried out by us in the course of economic reforms in the fifties, in particular in agriculture, and in the middle of the sixties in industry and in agriculture, and which has been sufficiently fully tested in various socialist countries, whose experience, of course, we have generalized in the most serious manner, this economic system is to a definite extent scientifically founded. Do we have divisions in this model scheme—let's agree to call it that: What must the center do, what must the territory, the industries do, what functions must the enterprise have? Yes, we do. We have them at a sufficiently detailed level, so as to immediately answer the second question, that is, the level at which decisions have been made on it.

The rights of enterprises and their functions and opportunities are registered, as you know, in the law on state enterprises. The appropriate functions of Gosplan and so on are registered in the appropriate resolutions on the restructuring of planning. Those of the financial bodies are registered in appropriate resolutions on the Ministry of Finances. On the basis of these resolutions—which exist separately for branch management bodies, for territorial bodies, for banks, for statistical bodies, for supply bodies, and for wholesale trade—on the basis of this specific regulations are being worked out, with a greater specificity of these functions and tasks and so on. Is there clarity as to how resources are distributed? Of course, it is a specific issue. Say, that same plan for 1988 divides it very accurately: How many resources go to the enterprise, and specifically, what types? How much goes to branch bodies, how much goes to territorial bodies, and how much goes to the central budget fund?

This distribution is going to change, of course, and there are estimates as to what it will be like when we completely transfer to the new economic mechanism, but the distribution of these resources will also substantially depend on a number of other reasons for change and various economic conditions. In the center of this whole concept lies the idea of transferring the enterprise, the association, in general, the organization of the main production link, to a system that is called the four-S system: That's independence, commercial viability, self-financing, and self-management [samostoyatelnost, samookupayemost, samofinansirovaniye, i samoupravleniye] with appropriate rights in every one of these directions.

So I feel that most likely, all the same, one can reply yes to your question although here there is a mass of details that require study, verification through practice. And to say that, standing on the shore and not yet in sight of full financial autonomy, we will foresee everything, we know everything, and we now have distributed resources in such a optimal way that you can't better it, that can't be said. For the time being these are the first steps that afterward will be refined, changed. We are in a process of adaptation, you know, adaptation to new conditions. One must, of course, understand our existing situation. We are in a transition period, it's the most unpleasant and the most complex period, because the main events of the economic reform lie ahead: That's the price reform and the transfer to wholesale trade.

For the time being this does not exist, and at the moment we are transferring enterprises and associations to financial autonomy, self-financing, and self management under conditions of a centralized supply system, under conditions of an old and useless, let's be frank, price system, that in many cases does not steer society toward advantage but in the opposite direction.

Under these conditions we must adjust the economy by means of what are maybe excessively minute state orders. We cannot let it take its natural course and expand economic freedom too much and grant the right to choose from a wide range. Why can't we grant such a right? Because the prices aren't right: They will choose the more profitable articles, and these more profitable articles are not the ones that are needed by the state because the old price that has been fixed is such that what is advantageous to the state is not always advantageous to the enterprise and conversely. You understand what the point is? I want to say in advance: none of us has yet lived in such a system, in a system using economic methods. Nobody has any experience of regulating this system. We imagine on the scientific level, in fairly general outline, how it will be. But when the practice begins, evidently a mass of issues will be clarified about which at present it is senseless to discuss and to be afraid of, or conversely, to be pleased about. Life will show. We'll have to go forward. We'll evidently have to adopt some additional measures, perhaps introduce new regulators, maybe not those economic quotas that we will now introduce, maybe some additional ones will have to be introduced. Perhaps some we have introduced today are not necessary.

I have thought of the following comparison—I apologize for the long reply, but it's evidently quite a general question—so, you want to learn how to swim, and to feel as comfortable in an aquatic medium as when you are walking on the ground, say. So, no matter how much they teach you this on shore, no matter how well you carry out these movements as if you were in the water, it doesn't mean that you can swim. Now you get in the water, and at first you begin to flounder, you begin to feel whether the water is holding you or not, although you can see through the example of others that it does, but you've got to feel this for yourself. Then you start to do it increasingly more confidently, and similarly we are also entering this economic water, if you like, which is new for us. How things stand on the shore with the administrative system we know very well, as with how to live as ordered by the administration-by-command system. As yet, however, we do not know how to swim in the economic water, although we study the experience of other countries that have been the first to get into this water and we see the difficulties and we assess them, and we see the advantages. But in order to regulate our own mechanism—which is more complex than in many other countries, it's very specific, after all we do have a distinctive country—we simply have to get into this water and start swimming. The necessary conditions have been created for this right now, the standardizing acts have been adopted, so let's get into this water and start swimming. If we see that we're not swimming fast enough, then something's not right and we'll fix it and regulate it.

[Zhiltsova] Well, dear comrades, our meeting has come to an end and allow me, on your behalf, to thank Abel Gezevich for this meeting. [applause]

'Unwarranted' Tatar Price Increase Revoked

PM081527 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Dec 87 Morning Edition p 3

[Report by own correspondent A. Sabirov under the "Republic Governments" rubric: "Potato Price Increase Revoked"]

[Text] The Tatar ASSR Council of Ministers has revoked the republic Gosagroprom's decision to raise prices on potatoes sold in "Plodoovoshch" stores.

The increase resulted from the regular seasonal reexamination of prices, but the only thing is that it constituted an exceptional leap—from 12 to 30 kopeks per kilogram. Potatoes are purchased from farms at 13-14 kopeks per kilogram, and there is no point in selling them to yourself at a loss, particularly as the actual prime cost of potatoes is 29 kopeks: The trade previously received a subsidy to cover losses.

The economic situation changes, and the state empowered local agroprom bodies to fix retail prices. In reality seasonal fluctuations of prices for potatoes, fruit, and other vegetables and price markups for products with enhanced customer appeal, higher quality, and greater presale preparation are possible. R. Ziyatdinov, chief of the "Tatplodovoshchprom," said that a special shop for washing, grading, and packing potatoes has been set up at Kazan's No 3 Wholesale-Retail Depot. And it was such choice, clean, and packaged potatoes that were priced at 30 kopeks.

However, the new shop was not in fact fully ready for work or equipped with the relevant equipment and was short of manpower. With the result that the potatoes the depot dispatched to the stores were in no way better but remained as before dirty and unsorted.

No one is denying agro-industrial complex bodies the right to fix the prices of particular products but, you will agree, customers should not be forced to pay merely for an intention to improve the quality of potatoes. That is why the Tatar Government has repealed the departmental decision.

But even the groundless price increase by the agroprom's accountants was not itself considered to be the main error. It is quite unacceptable that they should have adopted the resolution surreptitiously, in private, without making their reasons and intentions public. People were really taken aback by such shabby behavior.

It was, of course, a difficult fall. At the behest of the party obkom and republic Council of Ministers almost the whole of the people came to the assistance of the potato growers, as has already been reported in IZVESTIYA. Why, then, were the consumers' interests not taken into account when the matter was discussed in camera? It is clear that it is difficult to go over to financial accountability and self-financing, which is planned for 1 January 1988, without regulating prices. But can one eliminate losses and make potato production profitable by price rises alone?

After all, truth and justice do not lie in disguising excessive costs in high prices, the main way is to reduce production costs. Yield is still very low, labor in the fields is poorly organized, and transportation and storage losses are high. We do not want yields of 80-100 quintals of potatoes per hectare but yields of at least twice that, or even better—250-300 quintals—which is wholly realistic with family and lease contracts and the operation of intensive-labor collectives. There will then be a substantial profit and an acceptable price.

The Tatar Council of Ministers has issued a severe warning to the leaders of the autonomous republic's gosagroprom for their adoption of an unwarranted decision to raise prices. It was stressed that a onesided interpretation of pricing policy was mistaken and harmful and that any alteration of prices must be carried out publicly with prior discussion and elucidation of the measures being taken through the newspapers and radio and television.

RSFSR Ministry of Geology Abolished

PM091347 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 4 Dec 87 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "At the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium"]

[Text] In connection with the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decree of 7 September 1987 "On the Transformation of Certain USSR Union-Republic Ministries into USSR All-Union Ministries" the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has abolished the RSFSR Union-Republic Ministry of Geology.

Profile of Academician Trofimuk Published

PM081337 [Editorial Report] Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 1 December 1987 in its Second Edition carries on pages 3 and 6 under the headline "Map of His Life. Academician A. Trofimuk: 'Real Scientific Work Can Only Be Done With Clean Hands'" a 3,300-word article by PRAVDA correspondent Ye. Solomenko on the work of Academician A. Trofimuk, deputy chairman of the USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Department and director of the Institute of Geology and Geophysics. While working as a geologist during World War II, the author recalls, Trofimuk—in spite of official discouragement—searched for and found oil in the Kuganak and other regions of Siberia. "His relations with the ministries were complicated," Solomenko writes, relating how during the 1960s Trofimuk clashed with the Ministry of the Gas Industry when he proposed bringing gas from north Siberia, because economists thought this would be unprofitable; and how he was also criticized by the Ministry of the Petroleum Industry for wanting to bring oil from west Siberia—a region which, the author states, "will account for 70% of our entire domestic gas and petroleum production by the end of the present 5-year plan."

Solomenko stresses Trofimuk's "practical nature," describing him as a "fighting academician." In this context he also cites the academician's belief that "silence is tantamount to betrayal: I must tell the entire truth to the person on whom the solution of a question depends." The author illustrates this by citing the episode of Trofimuk's letter to the (unnamed) general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee appealing for help in averting the pollution of Lake Baykal: "The conclusions of the expert commission are based on falsified evidence, ...on unfounded claims by officials of the Ministry of the Timber, Pulp and Paper, and Wood Processing Industry which distort the essence of the matter..." The author here recalls how, in response to the looming menace to Baykal posed by "clouds of pernicious, criminal indifference," Trofimuk resolved to leave the geology institute he had set up and seek a transfer to the limnological institute on Baykal, and how he was prevented from doing so by the Central Committee, which told him to stay where he was.

The quotation of Trofimuk's words in the headline is intended, Solomenko states, to illustrate what he sees as Trofimuk's integrity as a scientist.

Scientific

'Cosmos-1902' Satellite Launched 15 Dec

LD160922 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 0905 GMT 16 Dec 87

["Cosmos-1902 in Flight"—TASS headline]

[text] Moscow, 16 December (TASS)—Another artificial earth satellite, the Cosmos-1902, was launched in the USSR on 15 December. Onboard the satellite is scientific equipment to continue space research.

The satellite was put into orbit with the following parameters: initial period of revolution: 92.4 minutes; maximum distance from the Earth's surface (apogee): 417 km; minimum distance from the Earth's surface (perigee): 373 km; inclination of orbit: 66 degrees.

Situated onboard the satellite, in addition to scientific equipment, is a radio system for precise measurement of elements of the orbit and a radiotelemetry system to transmit to earth data on the operation of instruments and scientific equipment.

The equipment installed onboard the satellite is operating normally. The coordinating and computing center is processing the incoming information.

Military

Further on Yazov Military Academy Speech

OW160745 Moscow Television Service in Russian
2300 GMT 12 Dec 87

[Speech by D. T. Yazov, USSR Minister of Defense, on 12 December at the Moscow RSFSR Supreme Soviet Higher Combined Arms Command School on the occasion of the 70th anniversary of the formation of the School; from the "I Serve the Soviet Union" program—recorded]

[Text] We are celebrating the jubilee of the institute during a memorable and dynamic time. The process of restructuring is gathering speed. The process has became irreversible. The armed forces are also experiencing the effects of restructuring. We have entered a new stage of this process. Today, the specific tasks that bring specific results have come to the forefront. The party has stated unambiguously: Enough of loud words and statements. What is needed now is more efficiency and responsibility. There is a need for constructive decisions and specific results in each work sector and in all spheres of life and activity. The first results are already at hand. The intensive work on further heightening the vigilance and combat readiness of Navy personnel and equipment is already bearing fruit, as is work on perfecting the style and method of leadership of the troops, and the fundamental strengthening of military discipline. A good example of this was the combat and political preparations and socialist competition undertaken in honor of the 70th anniversary of the Great October. The growth in the number of excellent specialists, the presence of excellent and good units, the noticeable reduction of crimes in the armed forces attests to this.

However, comrades, many problems remain. What has been achieved are but the first green shoots of restructuring. What we need now are more hearty plants. We place particular hope on your military school to strengthen the officer corps within the defense forces, and to respond to all the demands of restructuring. Your personal input into the solution of this task and selfless application has transformed the thorough theoretical knowledge and solid practical know-how into a high level of organization and discipline. The task consists of raising, to a new qualitative level, the whole teaching process, to strengthen its ties within the life of the troops, and to increase the political, military, and moral education of the cadets.

Recently, just before the beginning of the academic year, I had the opportunity to visit this Academy and to speak in detail about the tasks facing the military academy and the cadets. The head of the Academy referred to this in his speech. Today, I wish to emphasize the most important aspect: Let the present cadets at the Moscow RSFSR Supreme Soviet Higher Combined Arms Command School take as an example the courage and determination of the past generations of Kremlin Academy graduates and learn, just as they did, to love the motherland, to hate its foes until their hearts ache, and to suffer all tests in the name of the great goals of the Communist Party, the Soviet people, and our beautiful socialist fatherland.

Today you are a cadet. Tomorrow you will be a commander, an officer. Therefore it is today, right now, that you must seriously and intensively prepare for this great mission of yours. A commanding officer combines will and party character, energy and professionalism, and bears prime responsibility for the safety of the motherland. By virtue of your soul, duty, and vocation, not stinting efforts or sparing yourself, persistently master military and political knowledge, temper the steel of your character and strength, learn to obey and be obeyed. Preserve and augment the revolutionary and combat traditions of the Soviet Army.

Comrades, the general line of the Soviet military policies remains invariable — it consists of struggling for peace and prevention of war. The Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the

Elimination of Medium and Shorter-Range Missiles that has been signed is an important step along the path of eliminating the nuclear threat. It constitutes a huge political victory for our party and an important success for the new political thinking.

However, the situation in the world remains complex and tense through the fault of the bellicose imperialist circles. They wish, at all costs, to smash the military-strategic parity and to achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union. The CPSU Central Committee and the Soviet Government are doing all that is in its power to safeguard the security of the Soviet Union, our friends and allies. Socialism and peace are indivisible. We have on numerous occasions stated our desire for peace. Lenin said that peace is necessary for us, but we do not intend to be throttled to death in the name of peace either. This is why it is necessary for us to continue to increase vigilance and combat readiness, to strengthen discipline, raise the troops' political and moral state to a new level, and display a tireless concern for the technical equipping the Army and Navy and the improvement of control. The party counts firmly on the military cadres in resolving of the tasks of strengthening the country's defense capability. The confidence of the Soviet people in our might must be unshakable.

In conclusion, honored comrades, permit me to express firm confidence that the students, the command and political and teaching staff, by their selfless efforts will continue to augment the glorious traditions of the academy, to give all their efforts, knowledge, experience and ability to the glorious gains of the Great October and will, by real results gained from restructuring, worthily greet the 70th anniversary of the Soviet Armed Forces and the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference. I wish you, dear comrades, new successes in your studies, an officer corps loyal to the socialist motherland, health and personal happiness.

Officials' Sons Get Special Draft Treatment

PM151753 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 15 Dec 87 Second Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "They Complied...."]

[Text] Comrade N. Kuchma wrote the editors about gross violations of the procedure and regulations in drafting the sons of senior officials in Voroshilovgrad Oblast's Starobelskiy Rayon for active military service. At the editors' request, the Kiev Military District Political Directorate checked out the letter.

Colonel A. Govorov, deputy chief of the District Political Directorate, reported to the editors that the check established that during 1984-1987 the Starobelskiy Rayon Military Commissariat conducted the draft for active military service of the sons of V. Belashevskiy, first secretary of the party raykom; N. Vdovenko, raykom second secretary; V. Golubnichiy, secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party raykom; A. Neznayko, ispolkom chairman; A. Pushin, chief of power supplies; and S. Dudnik, chief of the transport repair enterprise, in accordance with the requirements of the USSR Law "On Compulsory Military Service." They have all served or are serving outside Voroshilovgrad Oblast.

At the same time, Lieutenant Colonel G. Gorbunov, department chief of the oblast military commissariat, and Lt Col V. Pilipenko, Starobelsk military commissar, committed violations of the USSR defense minister's corresponding order in earmarking draftees for branches of the armed forces and categories of troops. As a result of this, draftees V. Vdovenko, A. Neznayko, V. Dudnik, and V. Golubnichiy were sent to subunits subordinate to Voroshilovgrad Higher Military Aviation School for Navigators in defiance of the Starobelskiy Rayon Military Commissariat Rayon Draft Commission's decision.

It is also confirmed that unit commanders granted short-term leave for family reasons to servicemen A. Neznayko, V. Dudnik, V. Belashevskiy, and V. Vdovenko (twice).

Private A. Neznayko was repeatedly sent by his unit commander on official missions to his parents' place of residence in order to acquire construction materials for the unit's needs.

Abuses of their official position committed by Lt Col G. Gorbunov and Lt Col V. Pilipenko have been examined at the district directorate and at an official conference of rayon military commissars and department chiefs of Voroshilovgrad Oblast Military Commissariat. For gross violations Gorbunov and Pilipenko have been cautioned about incomplete compliance with their official duty and are having party proceedings instituted against them.

The circumstances of servicemen being sent on official missions and being granted short-term leave are being investigated.

Communists' Role in Forces Restructuring Viewed

PM151701 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 13 Dec 87 Second Edition p 2

[Correspondent Colonel V. Zhitarenko report under the rubric "Party Life: Reports on Progress in Restructuring": "Time Poses Questions Point-Blank"]

[Text] Moscow Military District—There is no denying that holding party meetings with reports by party committees and bureaus on the progress of restructuring is an absolutely special situation. Even the agenda alone indicates what a high degree of responsibility the party organ and the political department preparing such a meeting must have. It is faced with reviewing a very important period—the first stage of restructuring: what it was like for the regiment's party organization and whether the party committee had acted as the leader in this. Also, it is extremely important to take a look at tomorrow and determine how to resolve the fundamental task at the second stage of restructuring. Here, of course, the party committee must have its own clearly drawn up program of action. Precisely action, because the essence of the second stage is concrete results in restructuring.

It has to be bluntly stated that in this sense the party meeting held in the Marshal of Armored Troops P.P. Poluboyarov Shepetovskiy Guards' Tank Regiment did not provide complete satisfaction. Naturally, the discussion began with a report by Guards' Major A. Svetikov, secretary of the party committee. The report was in many ways traditional, although there seemed to be sufficient criticism. This was the impression: A militant report, although you could not perceive behind its "report" lines any militancy on the part of the party committee or party organization.

Why was this? I believe it reveals the inability of many of us to rise above current affairs and look at our everyday work from the height of those central problems of party strategy, which determine restructuring.

This is the first lesson from the meeting. It is useful to speak of it, if only to ensure that this is taken into account where such reports are prepared. That is, let us repeat, the party committee did not concretize its own restructuring program in accordance with the all-party program.

The second lesson. We are unable to profoundly determine stagnation phenomena in our own collective. How, then, are we to carry out restructuring? And not only determine but also concretize them with regard to a particular party organization or a particular Communist.

The third lesson. In party work we still frequently proceed from the scheme, not from life.

"Before the start of this discussion of ours, I spent approximately an hour in the regiment," Army General A. Lizichev, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, who participated in the meeting, said in his speech. "But, quite frankly, I obtained considerable information. The fact, for example, that soldiers are sometimes treated unjustly. But this does not worry Communists. In the library I asked what people read. Soldiers, for example, are now reading '100 Days to the Order.' But have party activists carried out work around this story? Held a readers' conference, say? They are still only making plans.... It is such examples that tell us whether the regiment vanguard is really marching in the vanguard...."

True, the meeting gradually "gathered momentum," and both the successes and the shortcomings of the party committee and the party organization began to stand out in greater relief. As well as that to which special attention must be devoted in the future.

The speakers—Guards' Senior Lieutenant I. Krichevtsov, Guards' Maj S. Kudinov, Guards' Maj A. Odinochnikov, and other Communists—spoke of particular shortcomings: inattention toward certain questions of strengthening military discipline; the fact that a certain school sends officers who have not been too well-trained; the fact that sergeants are not trusted in the regiment.... Again the question arises: Why did they not set about changing the state of affairs and display initiative and persistence? Why have the party committee and the party organization not become the vanguard here too...?

Undoubtedly, the demands of the times will increasingly frequently "pester" people in just this way: Why were they not the vanguard in resolving tasks, questions, and problems, why did they not change the situation, not achieve a breakthrough, not "take by force" the result that we need today?

So what, after all, did the meeting concretize in the sphere of developing and stepping up party work?

Stagnation phenomena must be clearly defined and eliminated. Everyone must analyze what is slowing him up personally. What in discipline? What in combat training? Is he close to his subordinates? Is his work style correct...? If he does not understand this, it means he will not overcome stagnation for a long time.

It is necessary to tackle very directly the creation of a new moral and ethical atmosphere in the party organization and in military collectives: to raise the quality of all political educational work to a new level for this; to have more lively, confidential discussion and dialogue about what is most urgent and vital. What is needed is an atmosphere of cheerfulness, not dejection; of enthusiasm, not depression.

For this, the company must be made the real center of all work with the soldier. Work in the company, in the basic party organization, and the latter's own active work in the military collective—this is the chief thing now. It is only possible to rely on a breakthrough and on new positive results in combat training and in strengthening discipline if every "link"—company commander, master sergeant, Komsomol organization, and so forth—is at the center of attention and receives assistance.

The party committee, it was pointed out at the meeting, must work on making the concept of "responsibility" specific. There is now quite a lot of amorphousness—"we underachieved," "we failed...." Guards' Lt Col Yu. Kleshchenko, regiment chief of staff, spoke and said that certain officers have an unscrupulous attitude toward organizing service and instilling firm regulation order, and that this question must be discussed once again at a party meeting or a party committee session. But people reasonably pointed out to the speaker:

"You are campaigning for one more meeting, and yet you have such rights—so instill order."

Indeed, official duty is sometimes eroded, but administrative functions are willy-nilly shifted onto party work.

Another point for action at the second, "business," stage of restructuring is the promptness of reaction to both good and bad.

Again, not just "to do party work" but to work with people.

There is no restructuring without a critical look at what we are doing and how. But it is time to move from "emotional" criticism to constructive, businesslike criticism. Logorrhea and demagoguery cause only harm. While criticizing—propose; while proposing—do...

Other aspects were also noted. I must name one more generalizing, paramount, determining aspect: the resolute enhancement of the vanguard role of Communists and their personal example and organizing activeness among the masses. The party committee and party bureaus have an effective instrument for resolving this task—strict, principled personal assessment of everyone. There is also a special methodological system of such assessment. Unfortunately, it is forgotten in some places. But exactingness is very necessary. Suffice it to say that just 52% of the regiment's Communists fulfilled their personal pledges in the competition....

Of course, there are things to think about in other areas of the party organizations' activity as well. The new stage, when the elaborated concept of restructuring is to merge actively with life, demands clarity of purpose and definiteness in the system of work. This is why meetings with reports by party committees and bureaus now mean so much.

Tactics of Conventional Defense Questioned

FM151215 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 9 Dec 87 First Edition p 2

[Report by correspondents Colonel G. Miranovich and Colonel V. Zhitarenko under the rubric "Preparing for the New Training Year": "What Makes Defense Strong? The Organizers of a Demonstration Exercise Attempted To Answer This Question"]

[Text] Let us make a reservation right away: Much of what the participants in this exercise saw went beyond the usual ideas about demonstrative measures. Usually what is demonstrated on exercises of this kind is what has already stood up to appropriate verification and given rise to no doubts. But here, on the contrary, there was something to doubt and ponder at each training point. Thus, the show exercise was something of an experiment in the process of which an intensive search was being made both in the methods of troop instruction in actions in defense and in the tactics of defensive combat proper.

This nature of the exercise was conditioned both by methodological considerations and by the command of the times. For it is no secret that an active search is now being made in combat training, as in other spheres of troop activity, for forms and methods of work which take the greatest possible account of the party's increased demands on the armed forces and of the fundamental points of military doctrine. And, as is known, our doctrine regards defense as the chief type of military operation in repulsing aggression. How best are we to teach the troops under the new conditions what to renounce and what to adopt?

While talking with the commander of the M.I. Kalinin Taman Guards' Motorized Rifle Division, at whose base the exercise was prepared, and with officers and soldiers of the subunits which directly conducted the demonstration, we repeatedly heard the word "difficult." Not that there is generally anything reprehensible in that. For a military person accustomed to the burdens and privations of life in the field, combat in defense, particularly in winter and under other complex climatic and geographic conditions, is a severe test. In this case, however, we are talking of difficulties of a different order.

We will speak later of some of the professional qualities, so to speak, that a serviceman needs in defense, which were manifested in the actions of personnel on this exercise and which have to be developed and improved. But we would like now to draw attention to the things without which success in combat is inconceivable, even given all the other factors which determine the reliability of defense. These are concepts which are, in general, familiar to us all, such as firmness of spirit, staunchness, courage, the ability to maintain combat activeness under the most difficult and dangerous conditions, and readiness for prolonged and frequently extreme exertion of moral and physical strength. Defense in this sense makes the toughest demands on a person. Thus, increased attention to defensive combat presupposes the enhanced quality of the training and instruction process as a whole.

The past training year has been a serious lesson for Taman Division servicemen in this respect. Many of them took the examination at the final check precisely in defensive training combat. Not all were up to scratch then. Unfortunately, the same can also be said of servicemen in some other formations and units. But there is nothing surprising in this. The subjects associated with training troops to operate in defense have been secondary for some time. Little attention has been devoted to them when planning combat training. The exercises and drills during which it was planned to rehearse elements of defense have frequently been conducted indulgently. One must suppose that this was largely conditioned by the difficulties associated with preparing for a demonstration exercise, as we heard at the division headquarters and in subunits. Too much was forgotten.... Naturally, the organizers of the exercise tried to take into account both the lessons connected with shortcomings in personnel training in defensive actions and the progressive experience already accumulated in this matter, in the process of restructuring.

So, the exercise showed that, indeed, not everyone finds things easy in a defense designed to confront an active, technically well-equipped enemy—and we cannot count on a weak enemy. We saw the hands of Guards' Private O. Usov, member of a grenade launcher team, a working guy from Norilsk, after he had set up his firing position. They were the hands of a laborer who had dug out more than 1 cubic meter of unyielding earth. They were the hands of a carpenter because, after making his way through a frozen layer of earth, the soldier had come up against a layer of sand and had had to reinforce the walls of the trench with the materials to hand. They were the hands of an artist because the grenade launcher had camouflaged his position—all done to a T... In general, they were the hands of an ordinary worker in defense, and it is these—probably above all—that make it strong.

Of course, not everything in defense is done by hand. If necessary, people are assisted by powerful bulldozers, fast earth-moving machines, excavators, crane trucks... The process of mechanizing engineering work will undoubtedly be deepened and improved. Yet we cannot dispense with soldiers' hands. In addition, the demands on the vitality of defense today are such that we must be able to set it up both in stone and in concrete. Where can we train people for this if not on exercises and drills on which questions of organizing and waging defensive combat are worked out? Consequently, the percentage of such exercises and drills in the overall system of personnel training must be far higher than it is now. Fifty-fifty—this is probably the most expedient and fair ratio of the time allocated to training for operations in attack and in defense.

For cogency, we can cite the following example. The attention of the participants in the demonstration exercise was attracted by the training point earmarked for working out questions connected with training personnel to operate in defensive combat in an urban environment. The division's representatives said, not without pride, that a record short time had been spent on setting it up. The project really is impressive. Here, even with a cursory inspection, it is not hard to see for yourself that defense, expertly executed in stone and concrete, can be an insuperable obstacle in the enemy's path. At the same time, you think of the fact that this was the case during the Great Patriotic War years. However, in pushing into the background subjects associated with training troops to operate in defense, we sometimes forgot the experience gained by the blood and sweat of front-line soldiers. If that had not happened, then perhaps we would not now be having to hastily create training places for which there has long been an urgent need. We would also like to emphasize this in connection with the fact that now that we are preparing for the Armed Forces' 70th anniversary and looking particularly closely at our combat history, every officer has an excellent opportunity to look creatively again and again at front-line experience through the prism of the demands of modern military doctrine and to draw practical conclusions for himself.

Obviously, our military scientists and historians also have to take a more profound look, from a military-professional viewpoint, at certain defensive operations of the Great Patriotic War period. Scientific recommendations based on creatively interpreted combat experience could be used both in the preparation of appropriate textbooks and in the practical work of commanders and staffs in organizing the training and instruction process and improving the material and technical base of training.

Let us return, however, to the soldier in the trench. When we approached the now familiar Guards' Pvt Usov, his overworked hands bearing traces of earth which had eaten into his skin were gripping an assault rifle. The grenade launcher, ready for use, lay nearby on the breastwork.

"Why do members of a grenade launch team need an assault rifle?" Usov repeated the question. "These are the company commander's orders, and it will be handier with it if the infantry sets off without tanks...."

Although an assault rifle in a grenade launcher's hands is an unusual phenomenon for motorized rifle troops, it was certainly no accident on this exercise. Just as it was no accident, for example, to see in the company under the command of Guards' Senior Lt V. Reznikov an apparently real, strong, three-embrasure reinforced-concrete pillbox of impressive dimensions but which subsequently proved to be an ordinary hill. Equally no accident was the lack of conformity with the demands of the combat regulations in the disposition of certain fire means in the defense region of the battalion commanded by Guards' Maj G. Stetsenko.... Much of what we saw in the positions of motorized riflemen, tankmen, artillerymen, and antiaircraft gunners was unusual because, as we heard, in defense people do not just sit—in defense they think. It was clear from the way Guards' Pvt Usov and his commanders and colleagues thought that the period time of restructuring is leaving its mark both on people's mentality and on their thinking.

It would seem that everyone has long known that defense is strong through activeness. It is also known that the activeness of defense consists in continuously hitting attacking troops by all means, imposing your will on the enemy, creating disadvantageous conditions for him to conduct combat, and carrying out a broad maneuver and counterattacks. The ultimate goal is to bleed the enemy white and rout him, but how frequently you still see on exercises someone organizing defense in the old way, with a view to frontal strikes, or blindly adhering to the prescribed intervals and distances when disposing combat vehicles, so that they cannot make full use of their potential for firing and maneuvering. We believe that not the least role here is also played by the approach to assessing subunits' actions in defense whereby it is not the desire to teach people but the requirement to observe at all costs the letter of a particular regulation document that is highlighted.

In this case too, not everyone succeeded in avoiding stereotypes in building defense and organizing a system of fire and interaction. In particular, certain antiaircraft facilities proved vulnerable to fire from an aerial "enemy" owing to their linear disposition. Not all command and observation posts were properly protected. The work of individual commanders in directing fire was confined to the single order "Fire." Nevertheless, the exercise organizers' gamble on creativity, initiative, and quest played its positive role. This was manifested in new methods of using certain types of weapons, as mentioned above, in camouflage for forces and means, and in the engineered equipping of the positions.

What is a tank like in defense? "A fortress," someone hardly acquainted with military matters will say. But even a fortress can be used in different ways. Near the position of the section headed by Guards' Sergeant S. Zyukin, for example, we saw a tank acting as a mobile reinforced-concrete pillbox. The motorized riflemen helped the tankmen not only to give the combat vehicle reliable cover but also to ensure its complete freedom to maneuver.

In defense, particularly when it is set up well in advance, the commander is able to see to its high technical activeness. But for this, he must know how to manage his terrain. Practice, including the exercise in question, shows that many commanders still have to learn and relearn in this sphere. Here is a characteristic episode. At the height of the battle, under the "enemy's" nose, as it were, sappers on the defending side started laying a minefield. This took place on territory not held by the "enemy." One wonders: Could the commander organizing the defense have created the line of engineered obstructions in advance, without jeopardizing people and hardware?

Something similar is also observed sometimes when making counterattacks. For some reason the counterattackers forget that they are operating on their own territory. They do not make use of the protective properties of the terrain or of the covered positions which they themselves prepared, and hardware is, in point of fact, used in just the same way as in offensive combat.

There was also another aspect of the exercise on which we would like to dwell in greater detail. Disengagement. When, according to the scenario instruction, the situation for the defenders evolved in such a way that the "enemy," although he had borne considerable losses in manpower and hardware, managed to increase the pressure, the senior chief ordered the subunit to disengage. That stage of the exercise showed particularly clearly how much in defense depends on the subunits' coordination, on personnel discipline, and on the commanders' ability to organize and continuously maintain the interaction of all forces and means. In this instance in particular Maj Stetsenko needed the ability to maintain efficient interaction with aircraft, artillery, and the tank subunit in a complex situation in order to halt the attackers for a while and remove the motorized riflemen's main forces from the range of their strikes. The battalion quickly disengaged under cover of the designated subunits, artillery fire, obstructions, and smoke.

The participants in the demonstration exercise received answers to many questions connected with the organization and conduct of defensive combat. But much still has to be interpreted, analyzed, and systematized with due regard to the specific conditions under which the tasks of the new training year will have to be resolved.

A seemingly elementary question. In the past, as is known, voices were heard to say that in attack a machinegunner is hindered by the bipod group. In attack—perhaps. But in defense, perhaps, an assault rifle will need that same bipod group in order to fire more effectively? Maybe the grenade launcher must also be armed with an assault rifle, as was done in the demonstration exercise? We should also think about the quality of the engineered hardware for setting up defensive positions and about other principles and methods of excavating those same trenches and command centers, including in hard and frozen ground. Think not only about improvised means but also about authorized means of reinforcing engineered structures set up in shifting ground....

Think about this on the basis both of the new potential and the new demands.

NOTES